


History's Most Terrifying Peace

Thirteen Reprinted and Original Articles

By

AUSTIN J. APP, Ph.D.



WESTERN FRONT
P. O. Box 27854
Hollywood, Calif. 90027
\$1.00

Copyright 1947 by the author, Austin J. App. Permission to reprint individual chapters in serial form is granted provided due credit is given. The right to translate and use individual chapters is also given.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

First printing, December, 1946, 2500 copies.
Second printing, February, 1947, 4000 copies
Third printing, May, 1970, 5000 copies

AUTHOR NOTE

Born in Milwaukee; B. A., 1924, St. Francis Seminary, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; M. A., 1926, Ph. D., 1929, The Catholic University, Washington, D. C. Spent four summers in Europe, 1927 (Spain and France), 1931 (Central Europe), 1932 (Great Britain and France), 1934 (Ireland). Cofounder and associate editor of Best Sellers, bimonthly review magazine.

Until drafted into the army in 1942, the writer was head of the English department, University of Scranton, Scranton, Pa. In 1947 he was professor of English at Incarnate Word College, San Antonio, Texas. In 1939 he was awarded the University of Scranton Faculty Medal as "outstanding educator of men."

His doctoral dissertation, Lancelot in English Literature (1929) was in 1965 re-published by Haskell House, New York. He is the author of hundreds of reviews and articles, a dozen pamphlets, eight books, his latest being Morgenthau Era Letters (1966, 109 pages, \$2.00). He is listed in Burke & Howe's American Authors and Books, in Catholic Authors II, in Book of Catholic Authors V, in Catholic Who's Who, and Who's Who in the East. He is co-founder of the magazine Best Sellers. His first interest is literature, but his second a just peace. He champions an Atlantic Charter peace everywhere, a restoration of the German Expellees of their Oder-Neisse and Sudeten homes and homelands and to the Palestinians of theirs, and he urges a policy of liberation of the Captive Nations under Soviet Russian colonialism as the only way to end the threat of a third world war.

Pamphlets by the same author complementing HISTORY'S MOST TERRIFYING PEACE.

"Ravishing the Women of Conquered Europe," 10 pp.
twenty copies \$1.

FOREWORD

◆◆◆

Who committed the greatest crime of this age? The Italians, Japanese, or Germans? Wrong. It is the Allies.

The official liaison officer between the German hierarchy and the American Military Government in Europe, Bishop Aloisius J. Muench, of Fargo, North Dakota, writes, "The forced migration of millions of people is the greatest crime of this age."

Who is committing this crime? The self-appointed re-educators of Germany and Japan, the United Nations organizers, are committing it. They planned it in the Potsdam agreement and got their justification for it in our American Morgenthau Plan.

"There is nothing in all history to equal it," writes Bishop Muench (Catholic Action News, Fargo, N. D., Nov., 1946), except perhaps one thing. What is that one thing which is perhaps even a greater atrocity than the Allied looting and expulsion of 12,000,000 peoples? It is the conspiracy of silence about it:

"There is nothing in all history to equal it, except perhaps the fact that there is neither an outcry against these atrocities by the peoples of other nations nor any action by governments with power to take it."

This collection of articles is published as one small little outcry against the atrocities of the peace and as one little torch-light against this perhaps greater atrocity, the slimy conspiracy of silence on the part of those who while "smearing" the vanquished in self-shielding war crimes trials are committing the most large-scale lootings, rapings, and expulsions in literally all of Christian history.

Time Magazine said (October 15, 1945): "Europe had emerged from history's most terrible war into history's most terrifying peace." The title of this group of articles was taken from that terrifying sentence.

Why "history's most terrifying peace"? Because the men who lend-leased this country into the war on the crusading pledges of the Atlantic Charter ended it with "America's eternal monument of shame, the Morgenthau plan for the destruction of the German-speaking people" (Senator Henrick Shipstead's words in the U. S. Senate, May 15, 1946). Because America, the self-appointed "arsenal of democracy" put its atom-age instruments of destruction recklessly into the hands of 170,000,000 Eurasian barbarians, well enough known to be godless and uncivilized, urged them to be "harsh" on the vanquished, and before accepting German surrender insisted that they be allowed to swarm all over Central Christian Europe where they "live off the land," loot, vandalize, slave-labor, and deport millions of people and outrage hundreds of thousands of children and women!

Our unconditional surrenderism and Morgenthauism blue-printed this "terrifying peace." The other victors, while more beastly than we, but for our scientific and civilized power, would never have got into Central Europe to achieve their bestialities. If the atrocities of this peace are not our crimes physically, it is we and only we who made them possible and whose harsh-peace propaganda encouraged them.

The personal, industrial, property, and territorial crimes the victors of this war are committing cry to heaven and must be stopped. It is the duty of every person whose decency and Christianity have not been entirely propagandized out of him to raise his voice and point his pen against them. I hope this book will move every reader to write at least one letter demanding a just peace to the President, to the Secretary of State, and to each of his congressmen. An individual can do little, but the little he can do, he must do.

If, as the atrocity blue-printer Morgenthau wrote, "Germany is Our Problem," then the shrieks of a million outraged German girls and mothers and nuns, and the moan of twelve million German fathers, mothers, and children sacked and deported from their homes, and the groans of five million German men exiled, starved, and abused as slave-laborers ought to sicken all Americans and keep them sick until these fearful crimes are stopped and all possible amends are made!

This book is a collection of articles either already published serially or written at differing times. Consequently they do not possess the unity of an integrated book, although they do have more unity than is usual in a book of articles. Some over-lapping occurs and a repetition of quotations—but these repetitions are of matters so important that the emphasis should not offend.

The reprinted articles are from Catholic Magazines—Our Sunday Visitor, the Magnificat, and the Catholic World—and many of the others were written mainly for Catholic institutions. Therefore, however much above creeds and nationalities the principles and implications of the book are, the non-Catholic readers must be prepared for some distinctively Catholic references. I hope these will not prove unpleasing to them.

I also hope that right-minded Jews will not be offended by anything in the book. However, so many of the harsh-peace revenge policies towards especially Germany and so many harsh-peace books have come from Jews that one cannot talk about a truly Christian peace without severely condemning the harsh-peace attitude of this vocal and influential Jewish clique of politicians and publicists. I sincerely regret this necessity.

I want to thank the magazines mentioned for permission to reprint the articles. I cannot here refrain from saying that the fact that these out-spoken just-peace articles could appear in Catholic magazines in these times of nationalistic war-hate insanity is a proof that even in war the Sermon-on-the-Mount Christianity retains a fairly vigorous hold among large numbers of Catholics.

For Protestants, the vigorous just-peace attitudes of the Christian Century gave similar evidence. The truth is that no matter how nationally low Christians sink during a war, they still never altogether lose a sense of justice towards the opponents and make a quicker comeback to common sense, justice, and charity than any other ideology in the world. I gladly recognize, however, that the Norman Thomas brand of socialists could not be blamed for disputing that assertion.

As for me, I wish more power to anybody whatsoever who wants a truly just peace for Italy, Japan, Germany and all the other vanquished nations—and for the double-crossed victorious ones like Poland. I want a just world order.

My appreciation and acknowledgment go to all the magazines, books, and papers from which I quoted. Lack of time and money made it impossible to write to all of these regarding the use of quotations. I was careful, however, to give due credit, and never to quote so lengthily as to hurt in the slightest the sales value of the original.

I also want to express my gratitude to all those who by so generously supporting my pamphlets entitled, "Ravishing the Women of Conquered Europe,"¹ and "Slave-laboring German Prisoners of War" gave me the courage to undertake this present publication. I hope that all people of good will who want to help change "history's most terrifying peace" into the kind of peace the Atlantic Charter swindlingly promised will again stand by me.

AUSTIN J. APP

BONIFACE PRESS
8207 FLOWER AVE.
TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND
20012

INTRODUCING THE SECOND PRINTING

The First Printing of 2500 copies was exhausted in less than two months. I naturally am gratified at the surprising success this book has met with and happy about the many favorable critical notices it has received. One Catholic weekly offers a copy free to every new subscriber.

I want to thank all those who so effectively furthered the distribution of the First Printing. May this Second Printing continue to do its bit in breaking the barbarities of the Morgenthau and Potsdam plans and help revive Christian justice and decency in people, in statesmen, and especially in the peacemakers.

February 21, 1947.

1. This ten-page pamphlet on the mistreatment of German, Austrian, and Hungarian women was published April 1, 1946. By June 26, the second revision and the 6th printing was published. To date 67,750 copies have been required. At least five magazines have reprinted it. It has been translated into Spanish and into Swedish and possibly into other languages. Of the Swedish translation, 10,000 copies are reported to have been distributed. On June 24, 1946, it was favorably quoted in Congress. The twenty-four-page pamphlet, "Slave-laboring German Prisoners of War," was published July 1, 1946. The Fourth Printing is dated February 5, 1947. It, too, has been reprinted several times in part or in whole. Its circulation so far is 18,000.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Foreword | III |
| Chapter I.-A Just Peace, the Chief Business of our Generation | 1 |
| Chapter II.-The Only Yardstick for a Just Peace | 10 |
| Chapter III.-Justice is One-- for Victor and Vanquished | 16 |
| Chapter IV.-Territorial Injustices | 28 |
| Chapter V.-Mass Expulsions: "Tragedy on a Prodigious Scale" | 38 |
| Chapter VI.-Is De-Nazification a Smokescreen for Bolshevikizing? | 46 |
| Chapter VII.-Teaching Russia How to Bolshevikize Prisoners of War | 53 |
| Chapter VIII.-Goethe and the Army of Occupation | 60 |
| Chapter IX.-A Just Or Merely an Enforced Peace | 67 |
| Chapter X.-The Fly in President Truman's Twelve Peace Points | 76 |
| Chapter XI.-Cooperating with Russia by Double-Crossing Small Peoples | 82 |
| Chapter XII.-American War Reasoning--1941-46 | 88 |
| Appendix.-American War Policies and Catholic Tradition | 93 |
| Conclusion | 103 |
| Index | 107 |

Chapter I

A JUST PEACE, THE CHIEF BUSINESS OF OUR GENERATION

This chapter is the Commencement Address given at St. Mary's University, San Pedro Playhouse, San Antonio, Texas, May 29, 1945. Though written as an address, it seems to me a good introduction for this volume. It suggests that our Morgenthau Plan is simply the horror and blunder of our Civil War Reconstruction applied to Germany and lists six necessary attitudes for a good peace. Since it was delivered for a Catholic college, it will reflect this purpose. The footnote was not a part of the original speech.

Twenty-five years ago, almost to the day, May 31, 1920, the then British Ambassador, Sir Auckland Campbell Geddes, gave the Commencement address at George Washington University. 1920 was just after the First World War. It was right after the just peace principles of Wilson's Fourteen Points had been tortured into the injustice of Versailles, so great an injustice that the late President Roosevelt in his last public discussion spoke of one of its terms as "the mistake made after the last war of demanding reparations in the form of money which Germany could never pay" (AP, Yalta Report to Congress, March 1, 1945).

At such a time the Commencement speaker said to the graduates of 1920:

"No man could have had a much more romantic or interesting life than I, and yet I almost find it in my heart to envy you. Why? Because the next fifty or sixty years are going to be the most glorious or the most disastrous in the history of the world You must prepare Keep ever before you the sense of your responsibility" (In Modern Eloquence, ed. by A. H. Thorndike, Vol. VII, p. 181).

Today, standing before you graduates twenty-five years later, I envy you too. You know the answer—whether the fifty years after 1920 were going to be the most glorious or the most disastrous in the history of the world—I envy you because, being graduated only now, you do not need to accept responsibility for the awful answer it turned out to be. A Europe that was supposed to have been made free for democracy has been turned into the greatest rubble heap in history—and brooding over it all are the spectre of communism and the fear and symptoms of another unjust peace, another caveman peace that degenerated from the Atlantic Charter to the shame of slave labor, dis-

membered provinces, deported populations and the barbaric consolation of mass war criminal executions.

I envy you because you cannot be blamed for the tragedy of the past. That blame belongs to us, who got our degrees ten, twenty, thirty years ago.

The Mistakes of Versailles and the Reconstruction Must Not be Repeated

I am very glad to address you at this your commencement of an active part in public affairs because we are again, as in 1920, at one of the world's critical crossroads. I want to warn you with all my faith and force not to let history repeat itself. I want to beg you to do all you can as educated men and women to prevent the mistakes and injustices of 1919.

America now stands with respect to Europe and Asia almost as in 1865 our North stood with respect to the South. What has been destroyed must be rebuilt. And the rebuilding must be done by everybody in proportion to resources and abilities. Reconstruction is not a matter of guilt. It is finally a matter of ability. Inexorably America will be the greatest factor in the reconstruction.

But reconstruction on the basis of an unjust peace will be like healing a bone before properly setting it. Such a bone will have to be painfully re-broken and reconstructed anew.

If we reconstruct Europe and Asia the way the North reconstructed the South—then the next few generations will be ruined. In 1865 Lincoln's malice-towards-none-charity-for-all plan was sabotaged for one of hate and vengeance by men whose "plan for dealing with the beaten South was to crush it so that it would never rise again" (Edwin Muller, "They Called It Reconstruction," Reader's Digest, October 1944, p. 121). Have you not heard these very same words applied by like saboteurs of justice to Germany and Japan?

Civil War Reconstructionists Like Present Morgenthauists Towards Germany and Japan

Those men—Thaddeus Stevens and his ilk—said of the defeated Southerners, "Humble the proud traitors, strip them of their bloated estates . . . desolate the section . . . reduce them

to hopeless feebleness" (Ibid., p. 121). Do you hear in these words the spirit of the Morgenthau plan for the defeated in this war?

They advanced their vengeance reconstruction on a wave of atrocity stories—a freedman had been burned to death, Choctaw County stunk with the dead bodies of murdered slaves, yes, the rumor was even circulated that Southern Belles had worn necklaces strung of Yankee eyeballs (James Morgan Read, *Atrocity Propaganda*, 1918-19, Yale Press, 1941, p.3).

In 1867 Stevens and his Radicals demanded an iron clad oath barring all Southerners from vote and office who had ever given aid or comfort to the Confederacy. This excluded nearly all whites—as a similar rule of aid and comfort to the Nazi Party would exclude the vast majority of Germans. Their plan was to "re-educate the South, forcibly. There was an influx of Yankee school teachers, burning to show the South the error of its ways . . . They taught that . . . Robert E. Lee was a perjured traitor, that Sherman's march to the sea was a glorious crusade" (Ibid., p. 125). That, Ladies and Gentlemen, was our plan of reconstruction for the vanquished of the Civil War. That plan was a calamity which after eighty years still hurts. That, proving how painfully mankind rises from revengeful barbarism, is the plan many Americans are again trying to apply to defeated peoples.

In Spite of Revenge Hounds, Honest Men Must Speak Up for a Just Peace

When during the Civil War Reconstruction President Andrew Johnson professed his conviction that one "could not proscribe a whole people forever" (Reader's Digest, Ibid., p. 122) he was nearly impeached. If in time of war hysteria even a president is nearly impeached for speaking common sense and urging justice towards a defeated enemy, then obviously no man who today demands, not merely in generalities but in specific terms, that the peace be just and honorable can escape abuse. Every time the Pope does so, large sections of the world press denounce him as a fascist. That is what war and atrocity stories do to people's judgment.

It is at this time above others that thoughtful and honest people must speak out for justice and fairness. Men and women

trained like you, in fine liberal colleges, must be to the world's wrongs what doctors are to epidemics: they must diagnose them correctly and treat them boldly—not shie away from them. If the tragedy of the last 25 years is not to be repeated, you must do what unfortunately most of us neglected after 1919. You must speak up for a just peace and for a vigorous Christian reconstruction, and you must never let up until it is achieved. That is the supreme obligation of our time.

I respectfully submit some standards and principles which must guide our thinking and acting on these matters..

First, There is No Soft or Hard Peace, Only a Just or Unjust Peace

The first is that God demands of us a just peace; He does not demand of us an enforced or a guaranteed peace. Peace in the nature of things cannot be guaranteed—it is a growing organism, not a fixed memorial. And as for enforcement, only a just peace may be enforced. Enforcing an unjust peace is a crime. Injustice must be corrected, not enforced. To make an unjust peace and to guarantee it by force is almost a presumptuous blasphemy, like the Tower of Babel. Pope Pius XII, (in a letter to the bishops, April 18, 1945) quoting St. Augustine, said, "You want peace? Act justly and you will have peace, because justice and peace are one." There is no soft or hard peace—there is only a just or unjust peace—and if it is unjust it may not be enforced, and it cannot be guaranteed.

Second, One Must Try to See the Side in the Other Side

Secondly, to be predisposed towards a just peace one must recognize that there are two sides to every question and to every major war. I hold that no one has a moral right to plan for war or peace who cannot see any side to the other side. For example, every admitted injustice in the Versailles Treaty is a point for the other side, and in a just peace all those points must be corrected.

Third, a Just Peace is Above Guilt or Non-Guilt

Third, a just peace along the lines of the Atlantic Charter and the Five Papal Peace Points has virtually nothing to do

with guilt or defeat. These plans, as a matter of course, are founded on right, not on might or self-righteousness. Maine is an American state whether we win or lose a war, or whether we are guilty or not. East Prussia must be adjudged in exactly the same way.

Fourth, Atrocities Must be Treated Exactly Alike for Victor and Vanquished

Fourth, atrocities, in like manner, must have no effect on the final peace settlement. Atrocity stories are the devil's device for getting good people to want a crooked peace. Since all people are sinful, all nations in war commit some atrocities. Let those specifically guilty of them, whether American, German, Russian or Japanese, be treated exactly alike and by the same rules—and there the matter should end. As for political war criminals, let them be treated according to accepted international laws. If it will be remembered that attacking Poland and attacking Finland, that purging Jews and purging kulaks, executing werewolves and executing Maquis are like and similar matters then there will hardly be added to the butcheries of the war also an orgy of war criminal butcheries in the peace. Someday society will be Christian enough to ban all death penalties—even those for espionage. Then one side won't praise as executions what in the other side it calls atrocities.

Fifth, Do to the Vanquished As You Would Wish to Be Done By If Vanquished

Fifth, a just peace must be based on Christ's Golden Rule: "All things therefore whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them." This is the only yardstick for a just peace. Every peace proposition ought to be checked by this yardstick. Pope Pius (Christmas Message, 1943) said:

"Do not ask from any member of the family of peoples, however small or weak, for the renunciation of substantial rights or vital necessities which you yourselves, if it were demanded of your people, would deem impracticable."

different provinces, to have Florida or Maine taken from us, If we had lost our admittedly unjust war against Spain in 1898, would we have considered it just to be split into four to have all our heavy industries banned, to be denied a chemical

industry, to have every part of our land occupied by foreign troops indefinitely? Would we even have considered it fair to be forever deprived of an army or navy? If not, then let us not do to others what we would have thought wrong if done to us. This rule is absolute—Christ cited no exceptions.

Sixth, Principles Must Be Applied Uncompromisingly to All Cases

Sixthly, in making peace there may be compromise in application but there must be perfectionism in principle. Lately the term perfectionist has been hurled at anybody who wants a just peace. We must declare absolutely that as to principle one cannot be right and wrong—one must be right. If self-determination is accepted as a sound principle, then it must be accepted for Danzig as well as for Trieste—or one cannot honestly accept it anywhere. If slave labor is declared wrong, then it must be as wrong for the Germans as for the Poles—or one cannot make an issue of it at all. If an ally absolutely insists on violating such a principle, then one must protest publicly that, while force will not be used to rectify, we will continue to use all our moral and juridical powers until the injustice is corrected. On no account must we talk or act as if the injustice were not an injustice, as we did in the case of the territorial despoilment of Finland, and in other cases since.

But in the details of applying a principle, compromise must be preferred to perfectionism. Where for example the exact Alsace-Lorraine German-French boundary cannot be accurately determined by plebiscite, compromise should be invoked and accepted. In that sense Pope Pius (May 13, 1942) called for a peace "arising from a free and fruitful agreement, even if it should not correspond in all points to their aspirations."

These are the attitudes and principles we as liberal men and women must promote to get a just peace and a sound reconstruction. Unconditional Surrender virtually precludes a just peace immediately—but we must keep urging the correction of any and all injustices in any peace settlement until they are corrected—no matter how many years it will take.

If the Peace is Unjust, Our Country Shares the Blame

Nor, if the peace is unjust must we be too ready to think the blame not our country's but an ally's. The most unjust

peace plan, one that horrified even some of our small allies, was the Morgenthau Plan for the de-industrialization of Germany. This plan, since largely adopted at Yalta (Time, April 2, 1945, p. 15), is an American contribution to an unjust peace—the Civil War Reconstruction horror all over again—and we must take full responsibility for it and urge its abandonment. A nation which is unjust on one point cannot complain if an ally is unjust on another point.

Peace Requires the Highest Effort of Christians

Peace is the greatest gift that Christianity promises us on earth. It is the reward to men of good will—that hardest of faculties—being fair and just to the other fellow in thought and deed. The principles I have outlined for a just and lasting peace are terribly hard; they are diametrically opposed to the Adam and the Eve in all of us. They require the most heroic effort of all our Christian background, training, tradition, and willpower.

Mere ordinary Christian effort is not enough. If it were, then the European part of this world war could not have been—because it was essentially a war between Christians. Nor should we graduates of Catholic universities complacently attribute the war to the split in Christian sects, or to a decline in religion, or to a growing materialism. Christianity's longest war, the Hundred Years War between France and England, in which Joan of Arc was burned as a war criminal, preceded all these. The truth is we had this war for the same reason we have always had wars—not because Christianity has declined, but because it has never been tried enough.

Had Catholics Been as Peace-loving as the Pope, the War Could Not Have Been a World War.

There are, for example, 300 million Catholics in the world now—more than ever before. Yet, except for those virtually neutral, half of these Catholics were on one side of the war, and the rest on the other. The European war was as much a war between Catholics as between Protestants or materialists. Every third German soldier was a Catholic, every fourth American, nearly every Italian soldier was a Catholic, and nearly every Polish and French soldier was Catholic. If the 300 million Catholics had truly understood and practised the Gos-

pel of peace, had been as Christian as the Pope, there simply could not have been a World War. Nor of course could there have been, had all Protestants been as Christian as the Pope. No, what we need is not essentially more, but better Christians—Christians who understand and practice the Sermon of the Mount.¹

A paragraph by Clare Booth Luce, congresswoman, beautifully and powerfully expresses the real truth. She said (October 18, 1944):

"For thousands of years, mankind, tortured by war, has cried aloud in anguish for a leader to publish a plan that would bring the world a just and happy and lasting peace. Yet, we know that such a plan has long been published. None has ever been more widely published, or more widely approved... Jesus' Sermon on the Mount. Unhappily, mankind has never fully accepted that Leadership, or ever put that plan for a just and lasting peace into effect, despite the fact that all other leaders and all other plans, deemed more politically practical in their day, have proven ineffectual" (Vital Speeches, Nov. 1, 1944, p. 43).

1. —In general terms, the Christians (Catholics and Protestants) were quite evenly divided between both sides. Only the Jews and Communists, and probably the Freemasons, were unanimously on only one side. It happens that the side they were unanimously on was also the only side that outraged nuns and indulged in mass rape; the only side some of whose occupation troops lived off the land; the only side whose occupation troops made a practice of personal looting and whose governments dignified large-scale looting as "reparations in kind"; the only side which, in robbing territories, also robbed of their personal belongings and deported, without any excuse of military necessity, millions of families; the only side which constituted itself judge, jury, and executioner on the basis of *ex post facto* laws made by itself, and hanged enemies for doing what they decorated and rewarded themselves for doing (Nazis hanged for using force to secure self-determination for Danzig; Stalin rewarded with Karelia for attacking Finland!); and the only side which abused prisoners of war as forced labor and reparation slaves in peacetime.

Both sides manipulated occupation currency to their advantage; both sides praised the other side's conscientious objectors but put its own in concentration camps; both sides put spies and saboteurs and obstructionists, including clerical ones, in concentration camps or executed them; both sides deported and put in concentration (relocation) camps minorities "suspected" of general disloyalty (60,000 Jews were deported from Vienna to Poland; 112,000 Japanese-Americans were similarly deported from the West Coast to inland camps); and both sides called the boys of the other side who bombed women and children and churches criminals and their own boys who did so especially glorious, extra-pay-worthy heroes! But only one side committed wholesale outrages against women and that happened to be the unanimous side of the Jews, Communists, and Freemasons. We are obviously speaking only of international bodies or organizations. If it were not precisely from these three groups that the most loud and influential eye-for-an-eye harsh-peace hounds come from, one might overlook all this!

Only Those Who Adopt the Sermon-on-the-Mount Peace Plan Are Men of Good Will Who Deserve Peace

You are the fortunate graduates of a fine Christian and Catholic college. You can understand the Peace Plan of Jesus, which Clare Booth Luce rightly says has never been tried. In these decisive days and critical years ahead, I urge you to live that plan, to think that plan, and to preach that plan—and not to accept any peace as final that violates this divine master plan of a just and lasting peace. If enough of us will be Christ-minded enough to do this, then the Baccalaureate speaker who will follow me here twenty-five years from now will be able to say, We have had a hard start, but have made sure progress. We are spreading the blessings of justice more and more fully to all races, nations, and creeds—and, God willing, we will keep the peace—because we are trying hard to be men of good will.

Chapter II

THE ONLY YARDSTICK FOR A JUST PEACE

This article appeared in OUR SUNDAY VISITOR, Huntington, Indiana, April 8, 1945. It elaborates the fifth point in 'A Just Peace, the Chief Business of Our Generation,' namely the Golden Rule. There is therefore some repetition of quotation. As a horrible example of Allied violation of the Golden Rule the case of East Prussia is cited which the Atlantic Charterites, Roosevelt and Churchill, thought of as a compensation to Poland for their conniving robbery of half of Poland by Russia. It was Churchill, now horrified by the mass expulsions in Eastern Europe, who proposed this atrocity for the East Prussians. 'Expulsion is the method,' he said in the House of Commons, Dec. 15, 1944, 'which, so far as we have been able to see, will be the most satisfactory and lasting.' It is men like that who can talk of trying Germans as war criminals and of re-educating the German nation!

When is a peace a just peace? "Everyone seems to feel very strongly," writes Dr. Herbert Wright, professor of international law at the Catholic University, that this war should be "ended by a just and honorable peace." Warningly, however, he continues, "The rub comes in determining just what is included in the phrase, 'just and honorable peace.'"

Aye, truly, there's the rub. When is the peace a just and honorable one?

Happily we have a yardstick for a just and honorable peace—one yardstick and one only. Christ in one emphatic sentence gave it to us. Pope Pius in another sentence, carefully kept out of newspaper headlines, specifically states how Christ's yardstick must be applied to this war.

The Pope's Christian Yardstick for This Peace

In his Christmas message of 1943, Pope Pius sternly warns the statesmen:

"Do not ask from any member of the family or peoples, however small or weak, for the renunciation of substantial rights or vital necessities which you yourself, if it were demanded of your people, would deem impracticable."

Many sentences pronounced by the Pope during the last five years in the interest of peace have been hailed as epoch-making. But no other one is as revolutionary as this. It does not merely call for a just peace, or lay down some points for one, it provides instead and requires the one and only yardstick for justice which God has given us—Don't demand of other people what if demanded of your people you would deem impracticable.

Christ's Sermon-on-the-Mount Golden Rule is the Final Yardstick

That supreme and final yardstick of justice was laid down nearly two thousand years ago when Christ on the Mount said,

"All things therefore whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them. For this is the law and the prophets" (Matt., vii, 12).

This is the law and the prophets—Do unto others what you would have them do unto you. Negatively this Golden Rule had been expressed before. In the Old Testament, Tobias said, "See thou never do to another what thou wouldest hate to have done to thee by another" (Tobias, v, 16). Among the pagans the Stoics, too, had declared it: "Do not to another what you would not that another should do to you." But Christ gave it the maximum emphasis; He said it summed up the law and the prophets. And more than that: He made it positive. "Do unto others," He declares, "what you would have them do unto you." Stated thus positively, it made necessary Point IV of the Atlantic Charter, which demands for all states "access on equal terms to the trade and raw materials of the world." As Christ stated it, one must neither rob a nation nor, if it be a have-not nation, refuse to give it what it needs and another has to give.

Rule Must be Applied Between Nations as Between Individuals

This is the supreme and absolute yardstick of justice. What does not measure up to it is not just. If we want a just peace, this yardstick is the only measure of it. For centuries now it has been recognized as a matter-of-course rule of justice between individuals. But, alas, in international relations, the world has been and still is in the jungle. "Jungle Diplomacy" is the title of the book by William Franklin Sands describing American diplomatic shenanigans in the Pacific.

Recently the Minister of New Zealand to the United States, Carl A. Berendsen, declared,

"The League's failure was a moral failure . . . the League failed because of a false and vicious idea that international morality differs in some way from individual morality" (Time, January 8, 1945).

Churchill Proposes Expulsion of German Families

In spite of Edmund Burke's great dictum that one cannot indict whole peoples, diplomacy has treated peoples as if they were things and not persons. Mr. Churchill, who would not throw a dog out of his kennel, calmly suggests that eight million Germans be torn up from their one-thousand-year-old homelands and deported, so that Poland can be recompensed for the Polish lands he would hand over to Russia.

The British Expulsion Crime Against the Acadians Shocked the World

When he deports eight million Germans is he punishing Germany, or is he punishing eight million German fathers, mothers, and children? In 1755 the British similarly deported a whole people as if they were things, the Acadians of Nova Scotia. Ninety-two years later Longfellow published a poem about one of these deported victims, Evangeline, and showed heartrendingly but too late that Mr. Churchill's forebears had not deported things, but persons, human beings, children of the same God our Father.

Therefore, when Christ said, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you," He meant it to apply to Evangeline as one, and to Evangeline as all the Acadians together. Christ's yardstick applies to one and to a million and to a billion. It applies to eighty million Germans, to eight million and to one; and it applies to one Pole and to thirty million Poles.

Equivalently, when the Pope says,

"Do not ask from any member of the family of peoples, however small or weak, for the renunciation of substantial rights or vital necessities which you yourselves if it were demanded of your people, would deem impractical."

he declares that a just peace means not doing to others what one would think unjust if others did to oneself. He says that if might does not make right then the winners must not do to

the losers what they would think wrong if the losers had the might to do to them.

The Reader Can Apply that Yardstick to Every Peace Proposition

One need not here apply this yardstick for the reader to particular peace propositions. Each reader can do so for himself. God's commandments are never so complicated that only the mighty can understand and apply them. What is needed is not the high I. Q., but the determined good will of which the angels sang. Any honest man can take any of the peace proposals and, according to Christ's standard, apply them to his own country. If they then make him shudder, they are criminal and must be denounced, even if a billion radio dollars have dialed them poisonously into the soul.

Oh, Christ was sent as a stumbling block to many. And the nationalistic passions that crucified Christ will also make His yardstick of a just peace hateful for many. But there must be no mistake about it. However hard it is to accept, His standard is that what would be wrong to us is wrong to anybody else. Christ made no exceptions. He did not give us any special privilege to do to the Poles or the Germans or the Japanese what we know would be wrong for them to do to us.

Either We Follow Christ's Yardstick or Make Another Jungle Peace

If we don't want to accept Christ's standard, then we simply don't want a just peace—and we don't get it. Mr. Berendsen, Minister from New Zealand, said peace "is a moral problem . . . If we fail to solve it as a moral problem we will solve it permanently in no other way." His Excellency, Archbishop S. A. Stritch, in his Christmas sermon, declared that for a just and permanent peace the Christian moral law is a categorical imperative. A Christian, he said, dare not be a defeatist who regards Christian justice as ideal but not expedient. A Christian is a realist who knows that there is a moral duty which can and must be applied, and cannot be compromised.

In 1919 we betrayed the Fourteen Points, and at Versailles reverted to the jungle. We felt we just simply couldn't adopt

Christ's yardstick or name Christ in the Treaty. In 1941, one of our Allies with whom we made the jungle peace of 1919 clashed with us at Pearl Harbor. God just doesn't help jungle action succeed—and man who can make jungle diplomacy cannot make it work. God gives us our alternatives. Either we listen to Him and do to others as we would be done by, or we obey our brutal instincts—deservedly to have our sons and brothers die again and again in foreign foxholes to which presidents will again and again promise they won't be sent.

God gave us the law, and He makes no exceptions, and He tolerates no fooling. Either we make war and peace on the principle of doing to others what we want them to do to us, or we will again bloodily learn that man proposes but God disposes. People who are not just do not deserve peace. Peace to men of good will, sang the angels. God does not punish the unjust with war. He does not have to. Jungle beasts kill each other without the help of God. Nations who make a jungle peace do likewise. Following Prime Minister Churchill's recent speech, the *Osservatore Romano* observed,

"The example of Poland makes one think of Versailles, where the last war should have been buried and, instead, the new one was planted.

Is there still time to learn while we are still on the way, and can the first obstacle enlighten, admonish, guide?"

Not Expediency But Justice is Our Duty: Justice at at Any Price

If our hearts rebel against applying Christ's yardstick, then it is well to remember that justice and charity are great virtues, not because they are easy, but because they are hard. It is much harder to be just than to chop somebody's ear off with a sword, as Peter did. Without prayer one cannot hope to be just.

It will help again and again to recall the following splendid paragraph of the greatest of English humanitarians. In *Unto This Last*, Ruskin wrote,

"... human actions never were intended by the Maker of men to be guided by balances of expediency, but by balances of justice. He has therefore rendered all endeavors to determine expediency futile forevermore. No man ever knew, or can know, what will be the ultimate result to himself, or to others, of any given line of conduct. But every man may know, and most of us do know,

what is a just and unjust act. And all of us may know also, that the consequences of justice will be ultimately the best possible, both to others and ourselves, though we can neither say what is best, nor how it is likely to come to pass."

In other words, we must be just even if we feel it will kill us. God is no monster. He cannot punish us for being just. But He does not need to punish us for being unjust—we will do that ourselves with another war.

Chapter III

JUSTICE IS ONE—FOR VICTOR AND VANQUISHED

The kindly and sympathetic editor of a Catholic magazine to whom this article was submitted rejected it with the words, "Your thesis is sound, and would be more convincing were it more calmly written" (August 27, 1945). Since I consider its thesis fundamental for any good peace, I included it here substantially as then written, but with footnote additions.

The pagans thought that might is right. When the Greeks won, the Trojans had no rights. Their men were all killed, their women were all raped, and their children became the kind of slaves our Negroes were before the Civil War. When the Romans won, the Carthaginians had no rights. Their men were all killed, their women and children raped and enslaved. The pagans thought the vanquished had no rights. But the pagans were wrong. For justice has always been the same. It has always been the one justice of the One God, always alike for victor and for vanquished. Man's wrong thinking has never made wrong thinking right. Eventually all the pagans who thought that might is right and that the vanquished have no rights were vanquished, and when in their turn they were butchered in accordance with their own former ideas, it may be supposed that they realized at long last that their ideas had been abominable—but they realize it too late.¹

Perhaps the ancient pagans and Jews might be excused for not knowing any better. But after Christ said, "You have heard that it hath been said: An eye for an eye . . . But I say to you, Love your enemies: do good to them that hate you" (Matt.v), there is no longer any excuse for double justice. Who deals in double justice undertakes, as the Chicago Tribune

Among the Old Testament Jews likewise, the vanquished were believed to have no rights. Moses told the Israelites that when they conquered cities far away, in which they did not want to live themselves, they should "slay all that are therein of the male sex," but of those cities in which they wanted to live themselves they shall "suffer none at all to live" (Deuteronomy, xx). When the Israelites took Jericho they "killed all that were in it, man and woman, young and old . . . But Josue saved Rahab the harlot and her father's house" (Josue, vi). This old Judaistic dispensation towards the vanquished serves to explain the murderous vindictiveness and thinly disguised extermination policy towards the Germans of the Morgenthau Plan and the many influential American Jews who support and advocate its policy and spirit.

phrases it, "to build a brave new world on the principles of anti-Christ" ("Uncle Sam: Slave Dealer," Feb. 20, 1946).

AMG Boy to Germans: You're Conquered. You Have No Rights

Nevertheless, one Allied Military Government head in Munich reportedly boasted self-righteously that for complaining Germans he had only one answer:

"Rights? You have no rights. You're conquered, ya hear? You started this war and you lost it. Get it through your heads: you lost. You got not rights" (Heinz Eulau, "Germans Have No Rights," New Republic, July 16, 1945, p.65).

Unfortunately, this AMG boy expresses the sentiment, not of course of men like Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago or the Most Rev. Aloisius J. Muench, bishop of Fargo, but of millions of Americans. Many newspapers and magazines and most movies express or imply this horribly unchristian attitude and most ordinary people naturally echo what their government officials and publicists inculcate.

Furthermore, even the more thoughtful, who would not specifically use those AMG words, unconsciously feel that while the victors as highly civilized human beings should be decently generous, the unconditionally surrendered Germans can nevertheless make no claims in justice but must entirely and contritely rely on the victor's generosity.

Common People Logical About Unconditional Surrender

No rights, only generosity to the vanquished, is the people's logical conclusion of the policy of unconditional surrender. This policy literally means that those who accept it resign all their rights. Allied statesmen may have meant something else by the words, just as the Russians seem to mean something other than we do by the word "democracy." But the phrase "Unconditional Surrender" means what the Greeks and Romans meant by it. When they achieved it, they spared when they wished, but more often, with no feeling of guilt, they killed, ravished, and enslaved. It is rather natural that our people should suppose "Unconditional Surrender" to mean what the words mean.

In fact, governmental and publicist propaganda specifically sold unconditional surrenderism to the people as the great device for making the vanquished recognize their rightlessness and their total dependence on the victors' will. It was continually pointed out that what wrecked the last peace was, not the injustices of Versailles, but Wilson's having promised the Germans the just Fourteen Points. When after surrender they were denied the Fourteen Points, it was and is argued, they felt they had a just complaint. This time, with unconditional surrender, no matter how harsh the peace conditions are, the vanquished will obviously have no right to complain, but will, on the other hand, have the obligation to be grateful for any little justice or generosity the victors choose to offer them!

AMG boys and the American public are, therefore, perfectly logical, when they interpret official policy to mean that the Germans have no rights: Hitler and Goebbels were also logical when they interpreted unconditional surrender as the Trojans and the Carthaginians interpreted it, and fought until they were dead. "Unconditional Surrender" either means Surrender Without Rights or it is not unconditional surrender. The American people and the German people (and the Japanese, and the Russian) are right in taking for granted that the Allied leaders would not have insisted so bitterly on the words "Unconditional Surrender" if they had not meant to empower thousands of AMG boys to say to the vanquished, "You have no rights."

Unconditional Surrenderists Did Not Understand Justice

The fact that millions of people believe that if the Fourteen Points had not been promised, the vanquished would not have had a right to insist on the principles expressed in them, and that if the vanquished surrendered unconditionally they forfeited all claims and rights and are justly dependent entirely on mercy and generosity proves that neither the nature of justice nor the function of treaties is at all understood.

Justice is eternal and it is absolute. It is the same for victors and vanquished. It is above and independent of treaties. It is instead the stern judge of treaties. Justice mightily takes every term of every treaty and puts it in the balance against Christ's words, "All things therefore whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them. For this is the law and the prophets," and if it does not balance with those words it stands condemned by God and eventually, if not immediately, accursed by man.

The Fourteen Points are valid, not because Wilson and the victors expressed them: they are valid, and therefore obligatory, because and in so far as they express justice. The Atlantic Charter is valid, not because Roosevelt and Churchill and thirty Allied governments expressed and endorsed it; its terms are valid, and therefore obligatory right and duty for winner and loser, strong or weak, because and in so far as they express eternal and inexorable justice. What is just, every man, every people, every nation must do, and every person, every people, every nation must demand, not as a charity, but as a right and as a law.

Justice Is Entirely Above Unconditional Surrender

Unconditional surrender does not empower the victors to violate any justice whatsoever. Time Magazine, entitling a paragraph, "Rights for the vanquished," quotes the Pope as follows:

"One who seeks reparations should base his claim on moral principles, respect for those inviolable natural rights which remain valid even for those who have surrendered unconditionally" (See Time, Jan. 7, 1946).

Supreme Court Justice, Frank Murphy, giving a minority opinion against the legal lynching of Gen. Tomoyuki Yamashita, said,

"The immutable rights of the individual belong not alone to the members of those nations that excel on the battlefield. They belong to every person in the world, victor or vanquished, whatever may be his race, color, or beliefs. No court or legislature or executive, not even the mightiest army in the world, can ever destroy them" (From Progressive, Feb. 11, 1946).

Unconditional surrender or victory does not create any special rights, and it does not take away any natural rights from the vanquished. The losers have the right and the duty to insist on their rights. In harmony with Christianity, they may not shoot and kill for their rights.² But they must insist on justice. Their leaders should do so heroically. When the German bishops aroused the wrath and the censorship of the AMG boys recently by protesting against Allied pillage and expulsions, prisoner of war labor-slavery, and de-Nazification methods, they opened several paragraphs with the words, "The

German people's sense of justice suffers also lately from the fact that" (Brooklyn Tablet, May 4, 1946). Their wording expressed exactly what is the duty of the leaders of the vanquished people. For the sake of their people, they ought to protest, even perhaps to martyrdom, all injustices of the victors. They must never let either victors or vanquished think for a moment that might makes right or that losing a war means losing rights.

Terms and Treaties Do not Establish Justice

Terms of surrender or of peace or of treaties do not create justice. When they are just, they merely advertize the justice. When they are unjust, they are invalid. A person must always treat another justly and honestly, contract or no contract. One nation must always treat another justly and fairly, treaty or no treaty, terms or no terms. The obligation of justice is equally absolute, with or without terms. Terms and contracts are merely proofs of good will. They are also valuable insurance against human forgetfulness and fickleness. Were all human beings perfectly wise and perfectly good, one would not have treaties or contracts. There are none between the Persons of the Holy Trinity. But between God and sinful and foolish man, who not only forgets or violates justice himself but suspects everyone else of the same propensity, there are covenants. So men and men, as an insurance against their future sinfulness and forgetfulness, draw up covenants, specify terms, and make treaties.

Some Obvious Propositions About Treaties and Justice

A little thought ought to make the following propositions obvious. People and nations must always be just towards one another, with or without terms or treaties. Terms and treaties do not create justice, they merely express it and declare mutual recognition of the justice involved, and offer insurance against future wilful or ignorant misinterpretation of that justice which was mutually recognized and accepted at the time of the treaty. Since treaties do not create but merely advertize justice, a thing does not become just merely because it is signed by two parties

2. In a letter to Cardinal Faulhaber, Pope Pius XII, while lamenting 'the base injuries and misadventures which German women and girls have had to suffer,' nevertheless goes on to say, "we insistently beseech all that, instead of taking recourse to force, the nation may rely on the normal procedures of justice" (Vatican City, NC: From Dubuque Witness, Jan. 10, 1946). In other words, even to halt wholesale rape by the unconditional surrenderists, recourse to shooting and killing is not allowed.

to a treaty. On the contrary, since the only purpose of treaties must be to insure justice, as soon as any term of a treaty, either through its effects or because of more enlightened concepts, becomes recognized as definitely unjust, it must be revised. In effect it becomes invalid and may be, possibly even must be, repudiated, though of course only after due regard has been taken that such repudiation will not do more harm than good, (a basic principle of justice for any action).

Unjust Terms Are Never Valid; Sometimes Must Be Repudiated

Injustice is never valid. Nevertheless, since few people ever consider that unjust terms are invalid, even when voluntarily signed by both parties, and that they may be repudiated, a little reflection on this point is called for. A man who has formed a pact to kill another must repudiate this contract as soon as he realizes the crime of it. A woman who has agreed to live in adultery with a man as long as he supports her must repudiate the arrangement as soon as she realizes the sin of it, even though he has continued to support her. Herod and Salome made a treaty that for her dance he should give her whatever she asked within his power up to half his kingdom. She asked for John the Baptist's head. Herod, reluctantly but bound by the treaty, executed St. John. Now it is quite clear to everybody that in as much as the treaty resulted in an obvious injustice, Herod should not have considered himself bound by it; in fact, had the duty to repudiate it.

If a nation signed a sole-guilt-clause treaty and subsequently impartial historians established, as after the last war, that, as Dorothy Thompson (*Foreign Affairs*, July 1935) puts it, "responsibility for the war was pretty generally distributed," then surely, since no man has the right to freeze a lie or an error forever, it would become not only the right but the duty of such a nation to repudiate the fallacious and unjust clause in the treaty. If a nation agreed to reparations which, when put into effect, brought about wholesale undernourishment and starvation, not only of those alive when the treaty was signed but those born after, then surely a nation would have, not only the right, but the duty, after due notice, to repudiate those terms.

No Treaty or Power on Earth Can Confer the Right to Continue an Injustice.

It is obvious that such intolerably unjust terms become invalid as soon as recognized, and may be or must be repudiated. But the fact is that every unjust term, as soon as clearly found unjust, may be repudiated as invalid and sometimes must be. It must be clearly understood that injustice never is valid and may never be continued. The only qualification comes from complementary principles of justice, namely, no mutual contract may be abrogated without advertizing the proposed plan to, and negotiating it with, the interested other party, and any repudiation must not unavoidably do more harm to mankind than good.

The right to repudiate as invalid any unjust terms exists even when both parties voluntarily agreed to them. No power on earth and certainly no contract can confer the right to do or to continue an injustice. Furthermore, the very essence of any treaty, of any contract, is that it should be mutual and voluntary. A woman forced to say "yes" at the altar at the point of a gun has not legally contracted marriage—nor can the man claim any rights from her "yes". Wilson rightly said that only a peace between equals is a peace. It is a curious thing that nations, since the days of their caveman cannibalisms, keep insisting, whenever they can, on dictating the peace at the point of a gun to the vanquished. And since those same caveman days, they never cease crying out in anguished and self-righteous surprise when those dictated to invariably reject the dictated peace as soon as they think themselves strong enough to do so!

A Treaty Which is Dictated is No Treaty

Yet nothing ought to be more self-evident than that the very essence of any treaty or contract is mutual, voluntary acceptance of it. A dictated, a starvation-and-gun-produced treaty is actually no treaty at all. As a treaty, it has no validity. The only validity it has is the validity of justice. For justice is eternally valid, treaty or no treaty. A peace treaty between nations can only be valid as a treaty if it is negotiated, if it is voluntarily accepted while both parties are still undefeated, that is, are still strong enough to refuse unjust terms. It is clear that unconditional surrender expressly kills any such possibility. And as is slowly being recognized, it reduces

an adversary to a point where there is nobody with whom to sign a peace.

Quite literally, after unconditional surrender there are no two equal parties who can sign a valid peace treaty. A child too young is said not to have the power of contract. A nation too weak to say no is likewise too weak to say yes validly. It may, like a child, accept favors; it may not, as a child may not, be made to sign away things, for it is not strong enough to have real liberty of action. Even if the victors should form some government for the vanquished which would accept all the terms, such a government is really a set of Quislings entirely unable validly to give away any of the birthrights of their occupied and prostrate peoples.

Actually the only thing the victors can do to an unconditionally surrendered country is impose a peace. Stripped of all fancy language, an imposed peace gives the vanquished the choice of being starved and shot down or of doing what the victors demand. That is the position the Germans are in. If might made right, then the Germans in their helpless position would have no rights, and should properly be grateful for any crumbs of generosity.

Might Does Not Give Man Right Over a Girl

But might does not make right. A man who meets a slight tender girl in a lonely spot has not a bit more right over her than if she were twice his size. In such a case the weak girl, even though she has no means of enforcement, will order the man to let her alone, as a matter of right; she will not beg it of him as a matter of charity. That is precisely the position of a vanquished nation.

However imperfectly accepted Christian principles still are, Christianity has nevertheless, after nearly two thousand years advanced far enough in some countries, including ours, that one can find some hooks on which to hang this contention. At a few points Christianity has succeeded far enough to enable one to convince our AMG boys, if not our Morgenthau's, Winchells and Baruches, that the vanquished have at least some rights. Among the pagans, the chief prize of victory was that all the adversary's women were subject to rape and sexual slavery. If the Germans have no rights then obviously no Ger-

man girl has the right to say "No" to any lustful American, British, or Russian soldier.³

No Trojan or Carthaginian girl had such a right, according to the pagans, for among the pagans (and also among the Ancient Jews), the vanquished really had no rights. But today with our advanced Christianity, even the AMG colonel who told Germans they had no rights would, if pinned down, admit that if a G.I. tried to outrage a German girl, her father and brothers would have the right to protect the girl—and that without humbly waiting for permission from the AMG boys. According to AP Dispatch (Frankfurt, June 25, 1946) "three American paratroopers stabbed and beat a German father and mother when they refused the Americans a midnight rendezvous with their daughter."

Evidently this German father and mother, though unconditional surrenderized, believed that they had the right to protect their daughter against even the almighty victor's debauchery. When a German Liberal Democratic party leader recently spoke of the world scandal, that the Russians outraged women, our

3. Alas, since this was written in July, 1945, even this argument, under the anti-Christian stampede of the crusading re-educators of Germany, has lost much of its cogency. Since then news has slowly come through that no Christian could have imagined even two years ago. In that time, the self-appointed Liberators have outraged more girls, mothers, nuns than have ever before been outraged in the Christian era. The unconditional surrenderists outraged more conquered women in one week, than the German armies in all their farflung occupations outraged in four years. In fact there is no comparison. See William Henry Chamberlin, "The Rape of Berlin," The New Leader, Dec. 29, 1945; and A. J. App's pamphlet, *Ravishing the Women of Conquered Europe*.

Our Russian fellow-trialists of the Germans especially claimed absolute right over the bodies of the conquered women. As Congressman Harold Knutson quotes in the Congressional Record (June 24, 1946), "Behind the Iron Curtain"; "Protestant deaconesses of the Lutheran (Evangelical) Church and Catholic nuns as well as many girls ranging from the age of 8 to women of 80 were raped. The Red soldiers stood, officers first, in long lines before their victims. During the first night many of the women were raped as often as 50 times. The women who defended themselves fiercely were either shot or abused in so shocking a fashion that they collapsed completely and were physically unable to struggle further." While the Russians committed this foulest of outrages, the British and American governments kept inviting them to help legally lynch German government officials, generals, industrialists, bankers and up to seven million soldiers for the "crime" of using force to give the Danzigers that right of self-determination demanded for all people in the Fourteen Points and in the Atlantic Charter!

This mass pagan-Old-Testament outraging of the conquered women is at first too much of a shock for anyone to think clearly. Soon, however, it becomes obvious that that is what the unconditional surrender policy, not only meant, but was for. Only for outraging the conquered women is unconditional surrender necessary. A weakening enemy can be brought to agree by negotiation to every unjust term—but one. That is the integrity of his women. No matter how battered, the Germans would never have acceded in negotiations to the debauchery of their women. To achieve that, the Allies needed unconditional surrender. They got it, and the Russians proceeded to rape the conquered women outright, and the Anglo-Americans proceeded to starve them into debauchery!

AMG boys sentenced him to five years in prison (AP, May 21, 1946). But in this case, so far at least, when the parents denied debauchery privileges to three American paratroopers, even the AMG boys have not put the parents in jail, but appear to think that the assaulting victors should be apprehended and possibly put on KP a day or two!

If German Girls Have One Right, Then All Germans Have Some

But if a German girl has the right and even the duty to say no to a lustful conqueror, whether she is strong enough to enforce her no or not, then the Germans have at least some rights and Colonel AMG's lecture to complaining Germans was wrong. A little further thinking will make it clear that just as a conqueror may not carry off a girl's honor, so he may not walk off with her wrist watch, or with her mother's silver ware, or with her father's cow. What one victor may not do, a million together may not do. Everybody in 1940 was quite convinced that the conquerors of France had no right to carry off Paris art works—or Paris women, or Paris goods and gold. What held for the Germans in Paris, holds for the Allies in Berlin. And it holds as a duty for the Allies, and as a right for the Germans.

Furthermore, the Germans must demand it as a right, not as a charity. A girl would be wrong and would deserve our scorn who would say to a lustful conqueror, "As our victors, I know you have a right to debauch me, but I beg you as a charity to spare me." This would be heresy; it would be a betrayal of the Christian foundation of society and putting it back on pagan quicksands, where there is no justice, only favoritism, where as Christ said, even the publicans love those that love them, but where no one loves his enemy. If it was wrong for some Germans to think with Plato that the individual exists for the state, it would be far more gravely wrong for them in their unconditional surrender to come to think that the vanquished have no rights in the face of the might of the conquerors.

The Vanquished Must Demand, the Victors Must Grant Complete Justice

No matter how weak they are, it is their right to demand, and the victor's duty to grant them, complete justice, a justice

as complete as society in this stage of Christianity is able to recognize it. The victors must heed and the vanquished must remind them of Wilson's words:

"The impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just. It must be a justice that plays no favorites and knows no standards but the equal rights of the several peoples concerned" (Sept. 27, 1918).

Unconditional Surrender Increased Our Responsibilities, Not Our Rights

Unconditional surrender does not give the victors the slightest right to be unjust. In a sense it makes their obligation to be scrupulously just all the greater. A nation that has killed and bombed another into unconditional surrender is in fact put upon its honor to be just. An adversary still standing is like a teacher in the room who can enforce honesty and in a way make honesty easy. But victors in an unconditionally surrendered country are like a class on the honor system with the teacher gone. Anyone who cheats on the honor system is rightly regarded with greater contempt than one who cheats under the eyes of a proctor. And so history will not judge the Allies less harshly if because of unconditional surrender they are unjust, but a great deal more harshly. And the Germans will judge them more harshly and more resentfully—and they will be right in so doing.

The Big Three Owe the Germans and the World an Atlantic Charter Peace

The Allies have presumptuously announced to the world and to the vanquished: We can dictate a peace that is just; we absolutely refuse to negotiate a peace with you, for such a peace would be marred by compromises. It is now up to the Allies to prove that they can impose a just peace.

What are the duties of the victors and the rights of the Germans? Justice—nothing more or less than justice. What is the justice which the Allies must create and grant? They must impose a peace that is honestly and sincerely, without equivocations, an Atlantic Charter peace. This Charter, declared by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill before we were in the war, was pledged by all the thirty-three United Nations, on January

1, 1942, and has since been reaffirmed in the Yalta Agreement. Consequently its principles have been recognized by all the victors as the principles of justice. The Allies therefore, to the extent of the Charter at least, know what justice is. God demands justice of them. Every man must demand justice of everybody and for everybody. Justice is everybody's business. That means the Germans, though they cannot and may not kill to get it, must demand it. It means that it is particularly the duty of the victors, who have the power and who are on their honor, to see that justice is done—impartially.

What the Atlantic Charter Assured the Germans (and the Japanese, and the Italians)

According to the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations manifesto of justice, the rights of the Germans (and of the Japanese and of the Italians and Hungarians and Finns) are that none of their lands be taken from them without "the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned"; that they may not be split into different countries if they want to be united; that they may "choose the form of government under which they will live"; that they be given "access, on equal terms, to the trade and raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity," which means that they may not be de-industrialized but must rather be helped to greater economic, agricultural, and industrial prosperity, that they may "traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance" and may therefore build what ships they need; and that their disarmament may not be forever unilateral but must be merely the first step towards the reduction of armaments of all nations, "pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security."

These are the principles all the United Nations have pledged themselves to establish should they win. They have won. They are now on their honor to fulfil their pledges. In so far as they are just, these principles and pledges are not merely the charitable hope but the inalienable right of the Germans (and Japanese and Italians), because justice is the duty and the right of all peoples. Justice is one—for victors and vanquished.

Chapter IV

TERRITORIAL INJUSTICES

This article appeared under this title in THE MAGNIFICAT (Manchester, N. H.), November, 1945. It quotes the various American and United Nations declarations that territories are not to be bartered about without the consent of the people living there, that territorial injustices are the chief long-term causes of war, that Allied statesmen who after their Atlantic Charter pledges commit such territorial injustices—in East Prussia, Karelia, Kurile Islands, Poland, anywhere—are war criminals.

A Christian will not enforce an unjust peace; a gangster, history shows, cannot. Senator Robert M. LaFollette, discussing the proposed San Francisco Charter, said in the senate on May 31, 1945:

"We must constantly remember that no permanent peace can be based on wrong, and that no world organization can be formed strong enough to maintain a bad peace."

This is of course what the Popes have said again and again. Pope Pius XII, for example, speaks of "justice, which alone can create and preserve peace" (Dec. 24, 1939) and declares that the real function of force must "consist in protecting and defending and not in lessening or suppressing rights" (Dec. 24, 1943).

Two Types of Injustices Common to Any Dictated Peace

Every dictated peace in the past has suffered from two broad types of injustices: territorial despoliation violating the wishes of the people living in the territories and commercial and economic exploitation and repression. One is the robbery of territories, the other is such things as harsh reparations, trade restrictions, de-industrialization, and slave labor.

Actually, the second type, the economic injustices, are the more cruel and insupportable. They lead to wholesale misery, starvation, and frustration. Of the multitude of unjust provisions of the Versailles Treaty, William C. Bullitt, on Wilson's staff at Versailles wrote:

"The most atrocious provisions of the Treaty were those dealing with reparations. They seemed to promise that for an indefinite future the entire German race would have to labor for the Allies ('Tragedy of Versailles,' Life, March 27, 1944).

Economic Injustices Are so Intolerable, They Tend to Correct Themselves

Yet, in spite of these intolerably brutal economic injustices of the Treaty, the actual incident over which the Second World War began was not one of these, but one of the territorial violations of Wilson's Fourteen Points. It is important to understand why this happens.

If ever America lost unconditionally and the victor, imitating the Allies of 1919, gave California to Japan, the Californians, though they would feel as horrified as the Karelian Finns recently grabbed by Russia, would nevertheless want to go on living. Many of the rest of us, on the contrary, if told that for "an indefinite future" we had to live on soup and slave overtime hours in order to hand over billions of dollars annually to our conquerors (who would keep snooping around to prevent our storing anything in the cellar for a rainy day), would soon rather die than go on living under such economic slavery. Economic injustices, such as those of the original Versailles Treaty, are clearly more intolerable than territorial robberies, (assuming that the robbed minorities are granted economic and social justice).

Nevertheless, they do not as specifically lead to new wars as do territorial injustices. This war started over Danzig, not over the reparation horrors. And there is a good reason for this, really a reason which shows that the greater the injustices in a peace treaty the faster they must be corrected, or they will lead to revolt. Precisely because economic injustices are intolerable, they do so much harm immediately, not only to the victims but also to the victors, that they simply cannot be made to work and must soon be corrected or modified. Of the "atrocious" reparations provisions of Versailles, former Ambassador Bullitt wrote: "In reality they were so unworkable that they produced financial and economic chaos and had to be revised." What misery, starvation, and frustrations they caused even during their few years of full existence, only the Last Judgment will reveal in its full satanic horror!

But the important thing is that economic injustices in their very nature prove so quick and sharp a boomerang that they are likely to be sufficiently revised before they fester into declared war. At present, for example, one of the most unchristian and intolerable propositions is the use by the Allies of German slave labor. Surely, if circumstances were reversed, most of us would rather die than spend twenty or more years in slave labor gangs working for the Japanese in Mongolia. But what is likely to happen to this brutal proposal? In a few years, not of course before it has produced unspeakable misery and pain, but certainly before it can provoke another war, the unemployment situation, partly arising from these very economic injustices, will bring this slave labor to a fuzzy end. With regard to serious economic injustices, it is as if God said: "In spite of your free will, I cannot bring myself to let you fallen sons of Adam succeed even for a limited time in brutalities as cruel to whole populations as these. In this matter of grave economic injustices you must be trained as a cat is house-trained until you give them up."

Territorial Injustices Fester Till Force Corrects Them

But in the matter of territorial injustices, God apparently does not force a similar automatic correction. Here He gives free, fallen man full scope to do his worst for the longest time until and only until a new balance of power or the avenging wrath of the victim's forces a change. At least that has so far been man's miserable history, which, it is hoped, an honest World Court, organized especially for the efficient revising of bad treaties, will reverse.

A World Court which does not have the power or the will to revise unjust territorial settlements is a vice for clamping injustices rather than a scale for correcting them. Such a court would be a hypocrisy and an abomination. If the Big Three are honest and sincere they know that a World Court will immediately have to revise any peace-dictated unjust territorial boundaries. They will, therefore, not indulge in territorial robberies in the first place.

A Territorial Injustice Becomes More Accursed with Age

Once a territorial robbery is committed, if put into effect for even only a short time, it becomes a very painful thing to correct. If California would by any treaty be given to Japan

even for only a few months, in that time changes would occur in population, home-ownership, and job-holding, which upon her restitution to the United States would work very real hardships upon many relatively innocent Japanese, just as the first shift would have worked cruel hardships on untold Californians. This is exactly what happens every time Finnish or Polish or German territory is handed about. Obviously, the longer the first unjust transfer lasts, the more widespread and deep-rooted all the accompanying injustices become and the more painful is the correction.

That is why, in the past, territorial robberies, no matter how obviously wrong, have seldom been corrected naturally and voluntarily. They have nearly always led finally to a bitter and avenging war. Sometimes a first territorial robbery started a series of conquests and reconquests that alternated for centuries to the endless miseries of the people living in the place and the enmity of both nations concerned. Alsace-Lorraine is such a province. Consequently any statesmen who introduce a new territorial injustice into the world's agonized history commit an unspeakable crime. That is why Woodrow Wilson in his speech to Congress, February 11, 1918, warned against "introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonisms that would be likely in time to break the peace of Europe, and consequently of the World."

Once a territorial injustice is introduced into the world, it seems as if the devil never again lets go of it until the whole territory has become a wasteland. God seems to step aside to let the devil do his worst. The reason seems to be that, while economic injustices are not always easy to evaluate, a territorial injustice cries out to everyone who has ears to hear. There is just nobody in the world so stupid as not to know that the East Prussians are Germans and not Russians and that their province is a part of Germany and not of Poland. When in spite of such screaming marks of right, the wrong is nevertheless committed God seems to turn away in disgust and cry, "A plague on both your houses."

Territorially "History's Most Terrifying Peace" Is Well Under Way

Now that territorial injustices have already been committed against Finland, and probably in fact and certainly in method against Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Rumania, and Hun-

gary, and still more obvious ones are apparently planned against Germany, it becomes imperative to review again the principles of territorial justice. These have been laid down so clearly and publicly by statesmen, and have been so widely accepted and pledged by the very peoples that now have the power to break them, that there is absolutely no excuse for violating them again. It was precisely over one of the clearest violations of these principles that World War II broke out, and it ought not to have surprised anyone. No man who now encourages or tolerates any such territorial injustices has any right to complain if at some future date his son gets mangled in another war. There is no excuse for territorial injustices whatever—and people who commit them have no right to wonder why God permits wars.

The wish of the people living in a territory is the final and absolute yardstick of territorial justice.¹ If the people of California in their obvious majority and with good intentions wished to belong to Japan rather than to the United States, then their wishes ought to be honored and not choked with bayonets. But if they want to belong to their native United States, then no matter how unconditionally Japan won a war, or how guilty we might have been in starting it, to deliver them to Japan would be a dastardly, unforgivable crime. When applied to California and Japan, Americans understand this. What is important is for them to get just as mad when their statesmen suggest perpetrating just such crimes with regard to East Prussia and Finnish Karelia.

1. In World War I, self-determination was America's great *Make-the-World-Safe-for-Democracy* club used to destroy Austria-Hungary and to shrink Germany. Now some of the former self-determinists like to forget it and say that it did not work. It did not work because it was not applied honestly. The scoundrels of Versailles applied it only where it did not affect their own countries, and wherever it damaged Germany and Austria. They did not grant it to Ireland or to India!

They invoked it to let 6,840,000 Czechs break away from 10,000,000 Austrians and Sudetens, but they did not let 1,179,000 Slovaks invoke it to break away from the Czechs, and worst of all, they violated the principle ruthlessly to tear 3,218,000 Sudetens away from Austria and force them under the unwelcome yoke of 6,840,000 Czechs. Wherever self-determination could possibly damage Germany and Austria, as in Alsace-Lorraine and Trieste, they invoked it; wherever it would help them, they denied it or ruthlessly violated it. They denied Germany and Austria and the Sudeten part of Austria the self-determination right to federate or even to form a customs union. They ruthlessly violated it in the case of Memel and Danzig, of various parts of Hungary and of Tyrol. Of the last, for example, William C. Bullitt, in "Tragedy of Versailles," wrote, "Two hundred and fifty thousand Austrian mountaineers of the Tyrol, of purest German stock, were given to Italy" (Life, March 27, 1944). Now these rascals say the principle of self-determination did not work! What those hypocrites mean is that since it cannot possibly be used to take any more territory from Germany and Austria, but, if honestly applied, would require the restoration of Danzig and Sudetenland and South Tyrol and the union of Germany and Austria, therefore the principle no longer serves and the ancient gangster yardstick of "security" must be invoked to "justify" some super-duper power-political robbery of German territory!

Where One Territorial Injustice Started World War II, the Big Three Want to Plant a Crop of Territorial Injustices

Quoting a recent news report, the following territorial shifts are being prepared without the consent of the peoples involved:

"Poland is sure to get in the west more than she loses to Soviet Russia east of the Curzon line. With Eastern Prussia, Pomerania and the eastern part of Brandenburg, Silesia falls into the Polish share of German spoils" (New York Times, June 26, 1945).

And as to the effect of these huge territorial robberies on the peoples involved, the report continues:

"Such huge transfers of territory from Polish to Russian, and from German to Polish, sovereignty must bring in their train corresponding shifts of population, either voluntary or compulsory . . . Warsaw will have to enforce drastic measures, to overrule individual preferences and choices."

Atlantic Charter: "Freely Expressed Wishes of the People Concerned"

This is the decision, according to the report, that "was arrived at by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin" at Yalta. It was also at the tail end of the Yalta agreement that these Big Three reaffirmed the Atlantic Charter. In Point II this once crusadingly proclaimed Charter declares that there are to be ". . . no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned." This Charter was signed not only by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, but by over thirty other Allied governments. In the face of this clear, unmistakable, solemnly pledged principle, any attempt ruthlessly to rip ten million Germans from their native country and force their homelands under a radically alien sovereignty is so blasphemous a violation of God's justice that every American ought to cry out in anguish and so loud that the most gangster-minded statesmen would stop in their thuglike tracks.

Wilson: "Provinces Are Not to be Bartered About"

The no-territorial-changes-without-the-consent-of-the-people principle of the Atlantic Charter was anticipated and most clearly elaborated and enunciated by Woodrow Wilson in his

four Principles Speech to Congress, February 11, 1918. He declared:

"2. That peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were chattels or pawns in a game, even the great game, now for ever discredited, of the balance of power; but that

"3. Every territorial settlement involved in this war must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned, and not as a part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims amongst rival States [no words could more clearly condemn compensating a Russian robbery from Poland by a Polish robbery from Germany]; and

"4. That all well-defined national aspirations shall be accorded the utmost satisfaction that can be accorded them without introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism that would be likely in time to break the peace of Europe, and consequently of the World."

Wish of People, Not Guilt or Innocence, or Winning or Losing

It will be noted that these principles are not made to depend upon who wins or loses a war, who starts it or suffers it. The only thing that counts is what the people living there want. Do they want to be German or Polish, Russian or Finnish, independent or federated. That is the decisive and only just principle. To tear East Prussia, a German province five hundred years before Maine became American, away from Germany and to cut the East Prussians, (people like our General Kruger of the Sixth Army who was born there), away from their fellow countrymen or their homes is simply so glaring a violation of this principle of territorial justice and of every instinct of humanity that any statesman who would do it ought to be regarded universally as a war criminal. What is true of East Prussia is of course even more true, if possible, of several other German, Baltic, and Balkan provinces.

Versailles Violated Principle at Danzig and Other Points

In his widely acclaimed but subsequently betrayed Fourteen Points, presented to Congress January 8, 1918, President Wilson made every territorial adjustment clearly dependent upon the indisputable wish of the people involved. Point 9 declares that "A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be ef-

fected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality." In the Versailles Treaty this was violated, when, as former Ambassador Bullitt says,

"Two hundred and fifty thousand Austrian mountaineers of the Tyrol, of purest German stock, were given to Italy."

However, though flagrantly violated, the principle that territorial shifts should be effected only along clearly recognizable lines of nationality had been plainly and emphatically stated. Similarly, Point 13, with regard to Poland, declares that

"An independent Polish State should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations."

This, too, was flagrantly violated in several instances, notably with regard to Danzig, which was indisputably non-Polish and which proved the powder dump that exploded into World War II. "The population of Danzig was over ninety per cent German and very consciously nationalistic," states the authoritative book, *Poland* (ed. B. E. Schmitt, University of California, Press, 1945, p. 395). In his *The Germans* (The Dial Press, 1932), Dr. George N. Shuster called Danzig "Europe's windiest corner" and prophesied the menace of a border that looked ". . . very like the havoc that might be wrought by a bad boy with a saw." But no one who heeded Point 13 could have committed this injustice which proved so tragic, most of all to Poland, in whose favor the injustice was committed.

The principle that provinces must not be switched about except with the consent and for the benefit of the people living in them was flamboyantly restated by President Wilson in his Four Ends Speech of July 4, 1918. Section 2 declares:

"The settlement of every question, whether of territory or sovereignty . . . [must be] upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned, and not upon the basis of the material interest or advantage of any other nation or people which may desire a different settlement for the sake of its own exterior influence or mastery."

Statesmen Who Tear East Prussia from Germany are War Criminals

Any statesman who, after these universally approved declarations, including Point II of the Atlantic Charter, tears

off East Prussia and Pomerania, two of the oldest German provinces, from the German mainland to reward a weak Ally for the robbery a strong Ally perpetrated against it surely deserves to be considered a traitor to humanity and to justice. Statesmen, who, in the face of the Wilsonian and Atlantic Charter declarations, approve the territorial robberies already perpetrated, such as that of Karelia from Finland, ought to be spewn out of the mouth of their people. If they cannot prevent such injustices, they must at least protest them: their approval or silent acceptance makes them accessories to these crimes against the Atlantic Charter.

Churchmen Uphold the Atlantic Charter Principle Too

The Wilsonian and Atlantic Charter self-determination principle regarding provinces, has received powerful episcopal endorsement. The Catholic bishops of the United States declared flatly: "We have no confidence in a peace which does not carry into effect, without reservations or equivocations, the principles of the Atlantic Charter" (Nov. 16, 1944). The "British Hierarchy's Peace Statement," issued February 23, 1945, in almost Wilsonian and Charter words declares specifically:

"The next Peace Conference must discover, however long the process, what demarcation of frontiers is most likely to meet the wishes of the inhabitants in the respective areas . . . While the wishes of the majority in all territorial disputes must be a paramount consideration, the rights of minorities must not in any way be infringed" (English Catholic Newsletter, Feb. 24, 1945).

All such territorial and minority problems, the English hierarchy insists, must be settled "solely with the intention of bringing content to the dwellers in territories whose sovereignty is in dispute."

Churchill: Territorial Injustices to Germany "Not a Good Augury for the Future"

East Prusia, Pomerania, and Brandenburg have never in six hundred years even been under dispute. Koenigsberg and Breslau have been German cities almost as long as London has been an English city. How can honorable statesmen even consider giving Koenigsberg, the home of the greatest German philosopher, to Russia? It was Kant, incidentally, who insisted

that "The saying fiat justitia pereat mundus . . . is a sound principle of justice that rejects all crooked ways, with their craftiness or violence" (*Zum ewigen Frieden*, pp. 45.47).

After the Big Three pledged in the Atlantic Charter not to change territories without the consent of the people whose home it is, it seems impossible that the American people will permit their statesmen to make a peace so appallingly unjust territorially that even Churchill, who first proposed violating the Atlantic Charter (Feb. 2, 1944), was moved to declare anxiously:

"I must put on record my own opinion that the provisional western frontier agreed upon for Poland, comprising as it does one quarter of the arable land of Germany, is not a good augury for the future" (See *Time*, Aug. 27, 1945).

Chapter V

MASS EXPULSIONS: "TRAGEDY ON A PRODIGIOUS SCALE"

This was the feature article, entitled, "Suppose the Tables Were Reversed," in OUR SUNDAY VISITOR, October 7, 1945. It was sub-titled, in Churchill's phrase, "'Tragedy on a Prodigious Scale' Would Be Ours," and "Expelling Millions of People from Their Homes Will Not Insure Peace." The utter robbery and expulsion of nine million people from their homes and homelands by the Allies is the most enormous official atrocity in all of the world's history. Before that staggering crime, all alleged Nazi crimes pale, and until Allied statesmen guilty of this atrocity are hanged, any self-respecting person will be too ashamed to "try" any Germans as war criminals! Writing from Europe, Bishop A. J. Muench of Fargo, liaison official between the German Hierarchy and the U. S. military government, calls the forced migrations of millions of people "the greatest crime of this age". He declares "There is nothing in all history to equal it" (NCWC Wire, Alamo Register, Nov. 15, 1946)!

According to the 1940 census Vermont has 359,231 people, New Hampshire 491,528, Rhode Island 713,346, Maine 847,-226, Connecticut 1,709,242, and Massachusetts has 4,316,721. The total for all New England therefore is 8,437,294, roughly eight and a half million men, women, and children.

If—if some hostile Big Three, having the biggest armies in the world and the atomic bomb, were to tell all these New England people to get out, to get out fast, to leave their homes and cattle behind, to take nothing with them but what they can push or carry, to get out across the borders of their homelands fast and on foot, then the world would see these New Englanders suffer "tragedy on a prodigious scale."

That is the kind of tragedy to which Winston Churchill is referring. He means the millions of German fathers and mothers and children that are being expelled from the German provinces of East Prussia, Pomerania, Posen, and Silesia which, in spite of the Atlantic Charter pledge to make "no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned," are being partitioned away from Germany.

These provinces, and cities like Koenigsberg and Breslau, are as anciently and essentially German as the New England states and Boston are American. Of this partitioning of Germany among Russia and Poland, Churchill said in the House of Commons (Aug. 16, 1945):

"I must put on record my own opinion that the provisional western frontier agreed upon for Poland, comprising as it does one-quarter of the arable land of Germany, is not a good augury for the future of Europe" (Time, Aug. 27, 1945).

The Great "Liberators" Stage the Largest Deportation Atrocity in History

But even more appalling is the ruthless expulsion of the millions of people who have had their homes there, and whose fathers and grandfathers for six hundred years before them have had their homes in these provinces. This mass expulsion Time Magazine describes as follows:

"In what was once eastern Germany, an anguished tide of humanity, one of the greatest mass movements of Germans in history, flowed toward the borders of the shrunken Reich. At least 10,000,000 hungry Germans were being uprooted from their old homes in East Prussia, Pomerania, Silesia, Sudetenland by the new Polish, Czech and Russian owners.

"The wanderers choked the roads in Russian-occupied Germany. Ragged, barefoot, with children in their arms, and the shabby remains of homes stacked on perambulators, carts and wheelbarrows, they trudged westward. But they were barred from the British and U. S. zones. No UNRRA was on hand to help, though their problem immensely outscaled that of Displaced Persons elsewhere in Europe" (August 13, 1945).

This is the mass expulsion to which Churchill alludes as "tragedy on a prodigious scale." He is indeed right. There has never before in history, not even in the worst of pagan times, been such a million-fold uprooting of human beings. Former transfers and expulsion of people, such as Hitler's transfer of Austrian mountaineers from Italy to Austria and the British expulsion of Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana, involved thousands and hundreds of thousands, but never millions.

Churchill: "Enormous Numbers Are Unaccounted For"
Churchill speaks of the present mass expulsion as follows:

"I am particularly concerned at this moment with reports reaching us of conditions under which the expulsion and exodus of Germans from new Poland have been carried out. Between 8,000,000 and 9,000,000 persons dwelt in these regions before the war . . . Enormous numbers are unaccounted for. Where have they gone and what is their fate? A similar condition may reproduce itself in modified form in numbers of expulsions of Sudetens and other Germans from Czechoslovakia." (Quoted from Brooklyn Tablet, Aug. 25, 1945).

Mr. Churchill asks, "Where have they gone and what is their fate?" An interview of the Most Rev. Clemens August Count von Galen, as reported by Dr. Max Jordan for N.C.W.C. News Service, throws some light on what their fate is. The Bishop, referring to "the forced evacuation of Germans," indicated to Dr. Jordan "that some 12,000,000 people are affected, about half of whom are Catholics." Dr. Jordan's interview continues:

"They were sent over the borders penniless to try to make their way into the Reich, but with the intense food scarcity prevailing everywhere and with no shelter available in cities, towns and even villages, all of which are overcrowded with refugees and evacuees, most of them remain stranded on the roads, thousands actually starving to death."

This tragic starvation crawl of eight to ten million peoples, whose only crime was that they lived and labored in lands where their forefathers before them lived and labored since the Middle Ages, moved Mr. Churchill to say to Parliament:

"Guarded accounts of what has happened, what is happening, had filtered through, but it is not impossible that tragedy on a prodigious scale is imposing itself behind the iron curtain which at present divides Europe in twain. I should welcome any statement which the Prime Minister can make which will relieve us or inform us on this very anxious and grievous matter."

The Self-righteous Big Three Keep Looking the Other Way

So far no one of the Big Three or their representatives made any statements that could bring any relief to a Christian-minded person. Only aggravating reports. Most of all, not one of the

great statesmen, so bent on punishing Axis crimes, has arisen to condemn or even to question this whole ghastly business of ruthlessly uprooting peoples from their age-old homes. Here and there a small voice is added to Churchill's that the expulsion should be carried out in a less brutal manner. But of the great victors, who once were so idealistic in the Atlantic Charter, none has arisen to condemn such expulsion as wrong in principle.

The Vatican: Expulsions "Contrary to the Law of Nature".¹

From the Vatican City, however, there does come a clear voice condemning in principle such expulsions of peoples. In an article entitled, "International Orientation," the Vatican newspaper *Osservatore Romano*, declares:

"It is contrary to the law of nature to remove millions and millions of persons from their homes, their churches and cemeteries, from the earth cultivated by the work of their fathers. It was unjust yesterday, and it is also unjust and ungenerous today."

The *Osservatore Romano* explains that as far back as his Christmas Message of 1941, while German arms were still winning,

"the Pope had spoken of the rights of minorities and the need of protecting them. Without believing the rumors of deportations, which, however, do not appear to be unreliable, it is only in keeping with objective reality to recognize that the Postdam Conference sanctions the principle of transference, that is, of the elimination of minorities."

And such transference, such expulsion, the article calls "contrary to the law of nature." Nor do honest and just people need elaborate proof that it is. What American, if it were done to him and his family, if because his country lost he were thrown out of his state and robbed of his home and belongings and forced to go on foot to another country, would not consider it a vile crime against nature?

1. In his 1945 Christmas Eve allocution, Pope Pius XII condemns the totalitarian "tyranny" which "With a stroke of the pen it changes the frontiers of states; . . . with ill-concealed cruelty it, too, drives millions of men, hundreds of families, in the most squalid misery, from their homes and lands, tears them out by the roots and wrenches them from a civilization and culture which they had striven for generations to develop" (See New York Times, Dec. 25, 1945).

The Expelled Families Are Ruthlessly Robbed of Home, Cattle, Furniture, Money, Even Food and Clothes

It must be emphasized that these people are not only thrown out of their homelands but are also ruthlessly robbed of all their belongings. A Tass dispatch of June 26, for example, declares that "President Benes had issued a decree confiscating the land of all Hungarians and Germans," even though these had owned it and lived there since Columbus discovered America!

All this is a horrible betrayal of the idealism of the Atlantic Charter. But more than that, it is even a betrayal of the early betrayers of that Charter. It was Mr. Churchill who on February 7, 1945, first boldly asked that the Atlantic Charter be violated so as to compensate Poland with East Prussia for Russia's demand of Polish territory, and who with regard to the East Prussian people hinted "steps far more drastic and effective than those which followed the last war." Yet now his "drastic steps" have become so prodigiously barbarous that he himself recoils, but the other Allied leaders unfortunately keep enlarging his first lapse from principle.

What the Soviets Did with the Criminal Policies America and Britain Suggested

How far leaders and public have sunk morally from their Atlantic Charter idealism to permit this mass expulsion and robbery of ten million people can best be seen by comparing our own Sumner Welles' early timid suggestion for violating the Charter with the monstrous violations now sanctioned. In his *Time for Decision*, published only a year ago, in 1944, he suggested that "The only solution . . . is to give Poland the province of East Prussia." But he feared that this "would constitute a flagrant violation of the assurance contained within the Atlantic Charter relative to the right of self-determination of all peoples," as indeed it is. Then he painfully developed an ingenious rationalization for getting around the Atlantic Charter in this matter. He argued that if one gave a German Province to Poland or Russia but did not force the Germans there to become Russian or Polish and instead allowed them to emigrate into shrunken Germany if they wished, then one could rob a territory without really violating the Charter. He added strongly, however, that every one "obliged to migrate be compensated in full for the losses he may incur by such removal."

The significant paragraph in full is as follows:

"In the adjustment proposed with regard to East Prussia there is no suggestion that peoples be transferred, like cattle, from one sovereignty to another. On the contrary, it is specifically recommended that every individual who desires to retain his former nationality be given full right to do so, and that any individual who, for that reason, is obliged to migrate be compensated in full for the losses he may incur by such removal" (Omnibook Abridgment, Nov. 1944, pp. 102).

A Principle Tampered with Becomes an Avalanche of Atrocities

The territorial transfer Sumner Welles proposed was a flagrant violation of the Atlantic Charter and of all Wilsonian principles—but nevertheless what a gulf between his plan for robbing one province only and the present Potsdam-planned robbery of one-fourth of the arable land of Germany, as Churchill puts it! And what a gulf between his giving the inhabitants a choice to stay or leave and paying them fully for their losses if they left, and the present Potsdam-endorsed wholesale expulsion of ten million people, the forced, ruthless expulsion of everybody and the complete robbery of their homes, their farms, their cattle, their household gods, of everything which they cannot carry in their enforced foot exodus!

That is what a war can do to the moral sensibilities of leaders and peoples, even peoples, who start with an Atlantic Charter signed by the Big Three and 30 other United Nations! *Osservatore Romano* calls this robbery and uprooting of millions "contrary to the law of nature." This horrible enforced transfer of minorities which is "contrary to the law of nature" is now being elevated to a United Nations principle. Incidentally, it does not only affect ten million Germans; it also affects hundreds of thousands of Hungarians, and perhaps several millions of Poles who lived in that part of Poland which the Big Three at Yalta gave to Russia.²

How Will We Mend the Principle We Helped the Russians Break

Someday—for God's mills of justice grind slow but sure—if we do not quickly reverse this truly savage principle, it may

2. The *Sunday Visitor* article ends here. The remaining paragraphs were added May 28, 1946.

affect us, or our children. The mightiest nations have been known eventually to lose a war! Cannot each of us write a letter to President Truman and another to each of our senators begging them not to make the United States a partner to the greatest mass atrocity so far recorded in history? Calling it the greatest mass atrocity so far recorded in history is not rhetoric. It is not ignorance of history. It is sober truth.

To slice three or four ancient provinces from a country, then loot and plunder nine million people of their houses, farms, cattle furniture, and even clothes, and then "forcibly and cruelly," as the German bishops in a pastoral charged, to expel them "from the land they have inhabited for 700 years" with no distinction "between the innocent and the guilty" (NC, Frankfurt: Dubuque Witness, May 23, 1946), to drive them like unwanted beasts on foot to far-off provinces, unprotected, shelterless, and starving is an atrocity so vast that history records none vaster. Time Magazine, describing the mass expulsion "of at least nine million Germans from East Prussia, Danzig, Silesia, Pomerania, the Sudetenland" exclaims, "It is a tale of horror, old men starving on the roads, young girls raped in boxcars" (Oct. 2, 1945, p. 27).

Potsdam's "Orderly and Humane Manner" Included Even Rape

Truly this is the most staggering atrocity in all history. It is deliberate, it is brutal, it is enormous—and it is an Allied crime. It is an American, British, Russian, Morgenthau Potsdam crime.³ Nine million people torn from their homeland, looted of all their possessions, driven away like cattle, starved and frozen on the way—and to make the largest atrocity in history also the foulest one—the girls and mothers raped!

These Mass Allied Expulsions Make Any German a Fool Who Still Thinks Germans Should Feel Guilty Towards the Victors

Writes a priest in a letter smuggled from Breslau, September 3, 1945, "In unending succession were girls, women, and nuns violated . . . Not merely in secret, in hidden corners, but in the sight of everybody, even in churches, in the streets and in public places were nuns, women and even eight-year-old girls attacked again and again. Mothers were violated before the eyes of their children; girls in the presence of their brothers; nuns, in the sight of pupils, were outraged again and again to their death and as corpses" ("In den Haenden unserer russischen Allierten," *Der Wanderer*, April 11, 1946). An American pastor confirms this. Sylvester C. Michelfelder, of the World Council of Churches, recently returning from Germany, writes, "The women and girls are violated in sight of everyone. They are stripped of their clothes" (See Senator Langer's *Famine in Germany*, p. 37).

The mass robbery and expulsion and abuse of nine million Germans is so vast and horrible a crime that before it all real and alleged German (or Nazi) crimes grow small. After that, Germans still have much to feel guilty of before God. But they have nothing to feel guilty of before the Big Three. Any German who still feels guilty before the Allies is a fool. Any American who thinks he should is a scoundrel.

3. At Quebec, in September 1944, Roosevelt urged the Morgenthau Plan, which among other Atlantic Charter violating injustices ordered that "Poland should get that part of East Prussia which doesn't go to the U.S.S.R." Regarding the People there, Morgenthau recommended that "Germans in ceded territories can be transferred to the new German states" (*Germany Is Our Problem*, p. 160). At Potsdam, British C. R. Attlee and American Harry S. Truman, along with Communist J. V. Stalin, ordered "that the transfer to Germany of German population, or elements thereof, remaining in Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, will have to be undertaken." They then hypocritically added, "They agree that any transfers that take place should be effected in an orderly and humane manner," as if one could rob families of their homes and homelands and dearest possessions in a "humane manner"!

Chapter VI

IS DE-NAZIFICATION A SMOKESCREEN FOR BOLSHEVIZING?

Reprinted with this title from OUR SUNDAY VISITOR, December 30, 1945. In no other respect, I believe, is Allied, including Catholic and Protestant thinking, so heretical and brutally irrational as with regard to Nazism and de-Nazification. Someday this heretical irrationality will cost us dearly. Nazism is variously spoken of as a political philosophy or as a religion. If it is a religion, then what right has one to war upon people, or to kill them or to put them into concentration camps, or to throw them out of homes or jobs because of their religion? If it is a religion, then bombing unmilitary Nuremberg merely because it was the Nazi shrine is as great an atrocity as it was to bomb Rome, or to have bombed Wittenberg or Mecca.

But if it is a political philosophy, since when has one a right to war on people, to kill them, to imprison them, or to throw them out of homes or jobs because of their political ideas? If one must rob a national socialist of his job, must one not much more rob a communist of his? And if we are justified in killing or imprisoning or job-robbing communists, wouldn't the Russian communists be justified in their killing, imprisoning, and job-robbing of Catholics and Lutherans and capitalists?

Can't Americans remember Bryon's "Prisoner of Chillon?" Can't the Allies grasp that no state or human power has a right over a man's religious or political beliefs? That states may only take cognizance of a man's action, and then not collectively but only individually? And on that basis, isn't it clear that, if the few hundred Nazis who committed rape must be hanged, the millions of communists and the thousands of New Dealers who committed it must be hanged, too, and all the Nazis who did not rape or loot or murder must be treated in exactly the same way as communists, New Dealers, and capitalists who did not rape or loot or murder?

This article touches on only one segment of the problem—the job-robbing. And the intent behind it. But on this whole matter of de-Nazification American thinking must change radically. Its monstrous hereticalness has already given the Russian Communists in every bit of territory they control a perfect excuse to kill, imprison, starve, or destroy economically every Catholic and Protestant (who logically appear as wrong to them as national socialists have been made to appear to Americans).

Was General Patton removed as military administrator of Catholic Bavaria because he "had failed to put Nazis out of office," or because he was unwilling to put Communists in? General Patton himself insisted, on September 25, that "There are no out-and-out Nazis in positions of importance whose removal has not already been carried out," that he was proceeding successfully, as successfully as he could while still insuring "ourselves that women, children and old men will not perish from hunger or cold."

In fact, all the world knew that General Patton had long ago appointed as minister president of Bavaria a man who had been in a Nazi prison, the Catholic Friederich Schaeffer—surely this was real de-Nazification from the top downward.

So-called De-Nazifiers Throw Catholic Out, Put Communist In

Nevertheless General Patton was removed, and "there was rejoicing in Moscow and in the Russian-controlled section of Berlin—and considerable jubilation among Reds and radicals in the United States over General Patton's 'disgrace'" (San Antonio Light, Oct. 18, 1945). Presumably it was their agitation that caused General Patton's removal—on the charge of failure to de-Nazify.

But as soon as General Patton was removed, what happened? Not a Nazi, but a Catholic was thrown out! Friederich Schaeffer was removed, and Dr. Wilhelm Hoegner, "a bitter anti-Catholic" and "an avowed enemy of the Catholic schools which constitute the greater part of the educational system of Catholic Bavaria" was made minister president (Dubuque Witness, "Bigotry in Bavaria?" Oct. 11, 1945).

And when Hoegner took office, he could not charge that Schaeffer was a Nazi, but declared instead that the new "government would go to the Left, probably include Communists in the Cabinet" (AP Dispatch, Oct. 1, 1945). "Hoegner charged Friederich Schaeffer was too far to the Right, with only one Red spot, in the labor ministry." In other words, nothing was wrong or Nazi about General Patton's Schaeffer except that he was not a bolshevizer.¹

Only a month later we read:

"American military authorities today granted legal recognition to the Communist party as the first of several political groups to operate with an official license in the U. S. occupation zone" (INS Dispatch, dated from Munich, Nov. 3, 1945).

Christians? or Reds, Radicals and De-Christianizers?

Isn't it preposterous that in Catholic Bavaria the American occupation authorities should first throw out a Catholic minister president, appoint an anti-Catholic Leftist, and should then recognize the Communist Party first and above every other possible group? All this under the pretext of de-Nazification!

Are the people who scream for de-Nazification, are the secret powers who direct the American occupation, true democratic and republican Americans, are they Christian in ideology, or are they Reds, radicals and de-Christianizers? Are they representative Americans or are they essentially, in fact or in spirit, refugees and fellow-travelers, like the fellow who held up the Fulda pastoral, "an expatriate German who left Germany in 1938," as a returned officer calls him, "and is now a model American citizen and upholder of democracy (Soviet style)" (Tablet, Oct. 27, 1945). The officer complains, "we are presently crawling with these people — and in uniform." Such Emil-Ludwig-minded persons seem to be the "Americans" who "de-Nazify" by throwing a Catholic out and putting a Communist in.

"Returning Chaplains tell us," says Father Wilfred Parsons in America (Oct. 13, 1945) that we have put Communists in everywhere as mayors in Italy. Is this stupidity, or is it malice?"

Is this socalled de-Nazification in reality an intentional or unintentional instrument to destroy the rights of private property, to bolshevize? After Patton and Schaeffer were gone,

1. In reference to Catholic Friederich Schaeffer the Jewish columnist Walter Winchell wrote, "The difference between Nazis and Germans is that the Nazis admit they are Nazis" (San Antonio Light, June 27, 1945). There are thirty million Catholics in Germany, including Theresa Neuman, American policy, so far not protested by authoritative Catholics, is that it is right to kill, or imprison, or at least to home-rob or job-rob Nazis. Now when Mr. Winchell, really echoing all the Jewish and communistic harsh-peace revenge boys, suggests that all Germans are Nazis, he really wants all Catholics executed, starved, imprisoned, or reduced to economic serfdom and day laborers. The same would happen to the Protestants. From that, one concludes that only the Bolsheviks or the Jews or both would be sufficiently elect and chosen to own and control Central Europe. If my deductions are not logical, I should be very happy to be shown how Mr. Winchell leaves room for Catholics and Protestants.

"Eisenhower issued a law making it illegal for any German business or other enterprise to employ a member of the Nazi party or its affiliated organizations in any other capacity than as an ordinary laborer" (AP, Dispatch, Oct. 3, 1945).

Job-robbing All Major Party Members Means Economic Chaos and Starvation

American headquarters revealed that ten million Germans were on the Nazi Party roster, and General Patton had said "More than half of the German people were Nazis and you'd be in a hell of a fix if you tried to remove all Party members" (Time, Oct. 1, 1945). Let anybody try to imagine what would happen if all Americans belonging to the Democratic (or Republican) party would suddenly be yanked out of their positions, not only their government and civil service positions, but out of all other positions, and forced to be laborers? Let anyone just stop a moment, think of particular men such as Ford, Sloan, Kennedy, and imagine what would happen to the country! To say nothing of the right or wrong of it, what could we do efficiently with so many "ordinary laborers?"

How criminally unjust it is to rob people indiscriminately of their jobs, merely because they belonged to a Party, is graphically driven home by Cardinal Faulhaber in a specific case. He says that thousands of devout German Catholics, who were forced into the Nazi Party, have been "driven to the brink of despair" by arbitrary dismissal from their jobs. Then he tells how his own grand niece, employed by a Munich industrial firm, had joined the Nazi Party when confronted with the alternative of losing her job, and was now ruthlessly thrown out of this job by the American occupation authorities because her name was on the Nazi Party file (Religious News Service, Oct. 18, 1945).²

2. It is amazing how the Morgenthauists keep justifying Hitler in his one indisputable and manifest error. Hitler thought Judaism and all Jews as bad as the Morgenthauists think national socialism and national socialists to be, and so he threw them out of all governmental, professional, and industrially executive positions. In other words, because he thought them all bad, he reduced them to laborers and those who did not obey he put into forced labor (concentration) camps. Since we are now doing exactly the same thing to the Nazis, it should prove that Hitler was precisely right! On what basis therefore are the Mosaic harsh-peace boys demanding their eye for an eye?

**Nazis, Like Communists, Must be Judged Individually,
for Deeds, Not Ideas**

Cardinal Faulhaber insisted on "the need to judge Germans individually and not in the mass." Among the paragraphs which the military censors deleted from the Fulda Pastoral was one which declares that mere membership in the Nazi Party is not enough cause for discrimination. The Pastoral says,

"It is, therefore, a demand of justice that the guilt be investigated in each individual case lest the innocent suffer with the guilty."^a

Violates Natural Rights

The truth is that one has no right to rob a person of his job merely because of membership in a political or religious party, even though that party is wrong in principle. The right to a job, paying a living wage, is a natural right, and the right to do the work for which one is trained or fitted is also a basic right. Though society has the right to remove or bar people with false ideas or bad party affiliations from positions where their influence would be directly harmful owing to these ideas or affiliations, it may not reduce all people with false ideas to the servitude of virtually enforced common laborers. We might, for example, bar the Communists, including Earl Browder, from certain governmental and educational jobs, but we may not force all Communists including Earl Browder to become day laborers, merely because their ideas are wrong or they belong to a bad political party. Earl Browder would be the first to admit this. But what he would demand for Communists, he and we must also assert for national socialists and fascists.

More recently, the German bishops in a joint pastoral declared even more pointedly, "Something else that comes to the German people like a nightmare is the often mistaken way in which the victors wish to cleanse offices of public life and administration of partisans of the old regime . . . we are obliged to declare that the German people's sense of justice is sorely touched by the dismissal of thousands of officials and managers without a moment's notice, by the arrests of thousands of others without judicial sentence, by their being deprived of freedom without any possibility of self defense, without any connection with their nearest relations" (From Brooklyn Tablet, May 4, 1946). Our AMG boys, over there to teach the Germans the Four Freedoms, told the bishops to withdraw that pastoral. The bishops obeyed—lest they, too, lose their jobs, for after all, Mr. Winchell claims all Germans are Nazis! That the bishops might lose their jobs is not at all fantastic. Lt. Gen. Lucius Clay has already reported with satisfaction that "83 politically-objectionable clergymen have already been removed" (See The Progressive, May 27, 1946)!

**From Job-robbing to Property-robbing is a Natural
(and Communistic) Step**

The terribly pertinent fact is that if we hold that we can remove Germans from positions in their own factories because of their ideas or party, then we can also rob them of their factories or properties. That brings us right back to barbarism and the dark ages. For if we grant that the Big Three can take a man's house away because he was a national socialist, they can also take it away because he is a Catholic, provided they think Catholicism is wrong. And many people throughout history have found it easy to think Catholicism wrong and dangerous, especially if it seemed to make it noble for them to confiscate Catholic property. What was, can be again. One cannot play with principles. One either lives up to them, or one is buried under them. At present our de-Nazification policy is helping the Communists to destroy the right of private property and to nationalize it.

**Bolshevizing Has Already Followed So-called
De-Nazification**

Here are some terrifying proofs. "Berlin's City Council (of whose five key members three are Communists) decreed the confiscation of all property owned by Nazis and 'all other persons who took an active part in the propagation of Naziism, who committed vile acts against others,' or made profits from the Nazi regime . . . business, houses and lands were presumably affected." Time Magazine (July 23, 1945) rightly declares that "this decree was equivalent to a nationalization of property," and the Berlin radio warned that "The importance of the decree is likely to reach far beyond Berlin." It will be clear that according to this decree the property of Cardinal Faulhaber's grand niece is subject to confiscation, if it be in Berlin!

In October the Soviet-controlled headquarters of the German Communist Party demanded that in the British zone and the Ruhr all mines and heavy industries should be taken over by the state, and declared in a Manifesto that the Communist party in the Ruhr demands that "all the property of active Nazis, of war manufacturers, and of mine owners be confiscated, as has already been done in the Soviet zone of occupation" (See Nord-Amerika, Oct. 25, 1945). Here de-Nazification has already been used as the starter for general bolshevizing.

If a Nazi's Factory Can Be Robbed, Why Not an Anti-Communist's School

Further, if it is right to confiscate the property of individuals, it is right to confiscate that of organizations. Why not? After all, they too at least read newspapers printed by Nazis! Logically, therefore, in the Soviet zone "All private schools were told to become public ones" (*Time*, Sept. 24, 1945). A more recent headline reads, "Reds Seize Protestant Hospital in Berlin." "Plans to confiscate the entire property of Queen Elizabeth Hospital here, one of the largest Protestant institutions of its kind in Germany, have been revealed by Russian occupation authorities" (RNS, Oct. 30, 1945). If one can take factories away from their owners, without trial or conviction, why not hospitals? Either we insist that the principle of private property hold for everybody, even for Nazis, or we cannot make it hold for anybody. If a Nazi committed a crime against an established law, let him be treated as a Communist, a Catholic, a democrat, a monarchist would be treated under the same circumstances. If he did not commit such a crime, he must be treated exactly as we want Cardinal Faulhaber's niece to be treated.

If Private Property Is Not Sacred in Germany, It Cannot Long Be Sacred Anywhere Else

If we don't insist that private property be respected in Germany we cannot insist that it be respected elsewhere. "Last week Red army officers reportedly took over at Zisterdorf (big Austrian oil field), booted the Austrian managers out" (*Time*, Oct. 15, 1945). When our Morgenthauists decreed that German property can be confiscated and robbed at will to de-Nazify Germany, they really wrote the red rules for bolshevizing everywhere. Even in Poland. There "The Reds have removed the equipment from all the larger factories . . . and have taken smaller factories from the owners and put them under Soviet Agents" (*Christian Century*, Sept. 19, 1945).

In other words, the Russians, with the help of the crooked principles of our Morgenthauists and Baruch planners are bolshevizing Christian central Europe. They are using de-Nazification as a smokescreen for de-Christianizing—for destroying private property and private schools. It is time Christians here woke up and protested loud enough to put a stop to it.

Chapter VII

TEACHING RUSSIA HOW TO BOLSHEVIZE PRISONERS OF WAR

This article was written in July 1946. On September 6, 1946, in Stuttgart, Germany, Secretary Byrnes boasted that the United States "has returned practically all prisoners of war that were in the United States" and plans to return those in "our custody in other parts of the world." In Italy, on October 2, 24,000 of the latter who had struck for repatriation, were beaten back to their slavery. Nevertheless, Christianity is painfully and belatedly replacing the Judaistic revenge policies of our government. This is good. But their harm cannot be undone. The Bolsheviks can now forever point to the example of the Great Moralizer, the self-appointed Arsenal of Democracy, as having sanctified the slave-labor abuse of prisoners of war and of having given them the choice of accepting the victor's politics OR his concentration camps. Our sins against German prisoners of war are lesser (though a great deal lesser) only in degree, not in kind than the Bolshevik crimes. However, better late repentance and reform than none. For a more detailed treatment of the horrible abuse of German prisoners of war by the victors, see the author's 24-page pamphlet, "Slave-Laboring German Prisoners of War."

Recently the Allied Prisoner of War problem has received some sharp attention. The Catholic bishops in their annual NCWC Spring meeting declared pointedly that one reason for the famine conditions in Europe is the fact that "Multitudes of civilians and prisoners of war have been deported and degraded into forced labor unworthy of human beings" (NC, Washington, May 5, 1946).

German Bishops: "Millions of German Prisoners of War . . . Put Like Slaves to Forced Labor"

About the same time the Catholic bishops of Germany, the same ones whom the Allies had formerly drooled over because of their opposition to Nazism, in a joint pastoral declared:

"The German people's sense of justice suffers also lately from the fact that today, almost twelve months after the cessation of hostilities, millions of German prisoners of war are still detained indefinitely, often under miserable conditions, and deprived of their freedom.

"Hundreds of thousands, if not millions, are put like slaves to forced labor, although the only thing with which they can be reproached is the fact that they were soldiers. Many of these poor fellows are without news from home and have not been allowed to send a sign of life to their dear ones."

According to Human Events (May 8, 1946), "Protestant church leaders of Western Germany, apparently in tacit agreement" similarly criticised "especially the expulsion of millions of Eastern Germans from their homes and the use of war prisoners as slave labor."

Our AMG Tells German Bishops to Be Quiet About Slave Labor Abuse of German Prisoners of War

Nevertheless, the American AMG authorities promptly requested the German bishops to withdraw the pastoral, and a spokesman declared that "the complaint about injustices suffered by German prisoners of war should be addressed to the French government" (N.C.W.C., Frankfurt, May 8, 1946; Tablet, May 11, 1946).

Commenting on this declaration, Max Jordan, reporting for N.C.W.C. from Basel, Switzerland, writes: "There are still nearly 5,000,000 German prisoners of war in the hands of the Allies, the majority of them in Russia and some 700,000 in France" (Tablet, May 18, 1946). He did not add, as he might have, that there are also possibly some 300,000 still in these United States.

Some Quaint Publicity About Our Own Handling of German Prisoners of War

Regarding those still in the United States there has also recently been some quaint publicity. In March the War Department revealed that it had been "giving German prisoners of war instruction in democratic citizenship" (Life, March 18, 1946, p. 91). Then it was further revealed that acceptance of the indoctrinated U. S. ideology has been made the passport for a German prisoner's return. The War Department apparently has adopted the policy: Either believe as we tell you to believe, or stay a barbed-wire prisoner forever. In "Experiment in

Democracy" (Colliers, May 25), Quentin Reynolds describes how 300 out of 2000 who had been subjected to such an indoctrination course, were adjudged

"not deserving of immediate return to Germany. They'd go back to their prison camps for further seasoning . . . said Colonel Smith, 'We send back to Germany only those who we believe are really democrats at heart.'"

Army Says: Accept Our Politics or Stay Behind Barbed Wires

All this reveals a three-fold American policy towards German prisoners of war: instead of returning them at the end of the war, they are being kept as labor slaves; they are being urged to submit to political indoctrination; and finally they are given the choice of accepting this indoctrination or remaining prisoners indefinitely.

Our Policy Violates International Convention Three Ways

This three-fold policy is a three-fold violation of both international law and of charity and justice. This violation may seem to be relatively harmless since it only hurts those racially abominable Germans who in their history have produced no one better than Goethe, Bach, Faulhaber, and Theresa of Konnersreuth! But when we think of it as a blueprint for the communistic Russians, its boomeranging nature can be more easily imagined.

International Law, specifically the American-signed Geneva Convention of 1929, requires that prisoners of war be returned as quickly as possible after cessation of hostilities. Article 75 reads:

"When belligerents conclude a convention of armistice, they must, in principle, have appear therein stipulations regarding the repatriation of prisoners of war. If it has not been possible to insert stipulations in this regard in such convention, belligerents shall nevertheless come to an agreement as soon as possible. In any case, repatriation of prisoners shall be effected with the least possible delay after the conclusion of peace."

This Article was violated when unconditional surrender was forced upon the Germans without allowing provisions for the proper treatment of their prisoners in Allied hands. It continues to be violated in that the prisoners are not yet returned.

The government tries to justify itself by quibbling verbally on the phrase "conclusion of peace." If that were valid, then one can only say that postponing the peace indefinitely after surrender is even a greater crime than slave-laboring the prisoners of war it is used to justify.

Influential Jew Insists Germans Be Kept As Prisoners and Criminals Forever

Earlier, the Army itself recognized that cessation of hostilities required the return of the prisoners. On V-E Day, according to Newsweek, May 21, 1945, "Briefly the Army informed its German prisoners that the Geneva Convention called for their repatriation as soon as possible after the end of hostilities." But the harsh-peace boys protested. Typical of them was Walter Winchell, who lumping all Catholic and Protestant prisoners together as Nazis, screeched:

"Sending back healthy Nazis to live in Germany is an insult to living and dead American soldiers. Those Nazi prisoners deserve to be put behind bars for the rest of their ignoble lives—like all vicious and hardened criminals" (On Broadway, Daily Mirror Feature, May, 1945).

According to the German bishops their only "crime" was "the fact that they were soldiers"!

Therefore, shortly after having recognized its duty to repatriate its German prisoners, the Army had to reverse itself, and announced that "300,000 Nazi POW'S here . . . will stay 'as long as it suits America's convenience'" (Newsweek, May 28, 1945, p. 34). And so America, the great self-acclaimed crusader for law and order, began violating the Geneva Convention, Article 75, which in the U. S. Statutes At Large, 72nd Congress 1931-1933, p. 2055, is officially summarized as "Release and repatriation upon cessation of hostilities."

Pope Wants German Prisoners "Regularly and Speedily Restored"

That not returning prisoners of war after cessation of hostilities offends against justice and charity is not only self-evident to Christian minds but appears from the Pope's words in his Christmas Eve allocution of 1945. He declared:

" . . . we remember with profound sorrow all those who, although the end of the war has been proclaimed, must this year again pass the beautiful season in a foreign land and feel . . . the torment of their uncertain lot and of their separation from parents, wives, children, brothers, sisters, all their dear ones."

He refers to them as "children, still held in prison," and prays, "May they receive and be comforted by our wish—shared by all who cherish the sense of man's brotherhood—to see them regularly and speedily restored to their anxious families and to their normal peacetime occupations."

Evidently our harsh-peace boys and the Morgenthauists in our government do not "cherish the sense of man's brotherhood," because even seven months after the Pope's words America is still indoctrinating German prisoners behind "barbed wires"!

If Nazis Had Indoctrinated Our Prisoners, the U. S. Was Ready to Call Doing So an Atrocity

Such indoctrination in our so-called democratic ideology is not specifically alluded to or mentioned in the Geneva Convention. That it violates the spirit of the Convention is however arguable from the fact that the government for a long time treated our indoctrination program as a top secret, "fearing unrestrained Nazi retaliation against U. S. prisoners in Germany in the form of 'education' by distortion and half-truth" (Life, March 18, 1946). Naturally, indoctrination by the Germans would be false and wicked, but by the Big Three, the American New Dealers, the British monarchists, and the Russian communists is all of the mantle of truth—and sweetness and light!

To Make Indoctrination Yardstick for Release Is Beastly and Criminal

The most horrifying phase of this indoctrination program, however, is the almost unbelievable policy of making it the yardstick for repatriating prisoners or keeping them barbed-wire slaves indefinitely, as the Collier's article quoted above indicates. The Army claims it is a volunteer program. But if a POW's choice is: Take and accept our indoctrination, or remain a slave-laborer behind barbed wire indefinitely, as is now the case, then it is not a volunteer program. It is instead a return to the old sixteenth century practice of executing or im-

prisoning people for their beliefs. As the Chicago Tribune, in the ringing editorial, "Uncle Sam: Slave Dealer," (Feb. 20, 1946), says,

"Our administration, along with our allies, both the godless ones and the professed Christians, is trying to turn the clock back to the times of pagan Rome. It has undertaken to build a brave new world on the principles of anti-Christ."

What If Bolsheviks Follow Our Practice and Say to 5,000,000 German Boys: Bolshevize, Or Stay in Siberia?

An America which takes its German war prisoners and says, Accept our ideology or rot in prison, most certainly is building its "brave new world" on anti-Christ, is justifying the Communists in taking it over. We have 300,000, perhaps including those we slave traded to the French, a million German prisoners. But the Bolsheviks have five million. From before unconditional surrender, if they have not killed them as they did the 8,600 Polish officers at Katyn (See Our Sunday Visitor, Dec. 3, 1944, p. 12), they still have 1,500,000, completely unheard from so far. After surrender, they took millions more.

The Way to Build a Brave New World on Anti-Christ

Furthermore, just as we rounded up German scientists to work for us here, so, asserts the Chicago Tribune, "Stalin rounded up all the German scientists he could lay his hands on and carried them off to Russia" (Quoted in Our Sunday Visitor, May 5, 1946). And if enemy scientists can be enslaved, why not enemy civilians! So the Russians quite logically applied to everybody Roosevelt's slave-labor principle, introduced at Quebec, September, 1944, in the Morgenthau Plan as "forced German labor outside Germany" (Section 5, d), and rounded up all workable males, often including clergymen, and hustled them off to their Bolshevik labor camps.

Anyhow, according to Senator William Langer (Famine in Germany, p. 19), "Russia Holds Five Million German Prisoners." The Pope, the American bishops, and the German bishops want them returned to their homes and families. But if America, the noble self-elected re-educator of Germany, can hold German prisoners indefinitely (including perhaps also rounded-

up German scientists) until they are "really democrats at heart," then of course the anti-Christian Stalin would be a fool to return his five million German prisoners before they are really communists at heart! That will go a long way towards handing "the brave new world" to anti-Christ.

Chapter VIII

GOETHE AND THE ARMY OF OCCUPATION

This article, as entitled, appeared in THE MAGNIFICAT, July, 1946, pages 157-160. In an article entitled, "We Play Master Race" (PROGRESSIVE, October 7, 1946) William Henry Chamberlin writes, "I emerged from Germany . . . profoundly convinced that up to the present time pompous talk about 're-educating the Germans along democratic lines' is a compound of stupidity and hypocrisy." Goethe knew the French occupation of Germany. May the Germans who know our occupation be as generous as he in their judgment of us!

Armies of occupation regularly give much evidence that man has developed from the savage, very little that he has a soul made in the image of God. Yet now and then a conqueror rises to a proof of his higher nature. When he does, the world in secret pride, never willingly forgets.

In May the American army took over the Bavarian town of Garmisch-Partenkirchen. In one of its homes lived Richard Strauss, an old patriarch of eighty, composer of the beautiful and universally beloved Rosenkavalier. Over his door the occupation troops nailed the crisp order, Clear out by morning. The way of occupation armies is ruthless!

But sometimes a touch of humanity happily asserts itself. A. M. G. officials, becoming aware that in this particular house lived the particular old, old man who is Richard Strauss, "took down the sign," Time (May 14, 1945) reports. "The composer stayed at home unmolested, continued to work on his new one-act opera called Capriccio." There was an act of chivalry which the world will easily remember long after it has anxiously tried to forget the rape of two thousand Stuttgart girls (Reported in the U. S. Senate, July 17, 1945).

Napoleon Ordered His Army of Occupation to Spare Poet

Once before a great German author was ordered spared by a mighty conquering invader. In the spring of 1945 American columns marched into Weimar. One hundred and thirty-three

years ago, it was the French army under Napoleon that occupied this Weimar of music and poetry. There at the time lived and wrote Germany's greatest poet, often called the "Napoleon of the Intellect." Goethe was then a grand old man of sixty-three. Luckily for him, Napoleon had read his Sorrows of Werther seven times, just as Roosevelt had probably heard Strauss's Rosenkavalier at least seven times. And so history records another one of those rare acts of chivalry and decency on the part of conquerors. Napoleon ordered that the old poet, the chief glory of his vanquished opponents, be unmolested. The world is proud to remember this act of generosity.

French Dragged Old Poet From Bed

Napoleon's order kept the old poet from want and the kind of starvation which Mrs. Roosevelt says the German people in the coming Winter will taste and which "is as it should be" (Column, N. Y. World Telegram, Aug. 20, 1945). Nevertheless, though the poet was kept from want, forty French soldiers were quartered in his home.

Worse than that, on one occasion ". . . some drunken French soldiers forced their way into his bedroom, dragged the aged poet from his bed and threatened to kill him, unless he turned over all his money to them." Only the timely arrival of his wife, his butler, and his gardener prevented serious harm (See Catholic World, September, 1933, p. 682).

But Goethe Never Became a French-Hater

Yet in spite of the injuries done to his native city and to his Fatherland, and in spite of these indignities and inconveniences to himself, Goethe never became a French-hater. He never lost his perspective or his sense of justice and fairness. He recognized the truth that an army of occupation is for the time being the legitimate authority and entitled to obedience and a certain amount of co-operation. Whereas, for example, our writers, when the Germans occupied France, continued to urge the French people to resistance and sabotage, while simultaneously blaming the Germans if as a result of such sabotage food distribution was impaired, Goethe urged no such sabotage and himself refused to join such underground movements.

Germans Act Right Under American Occupation

An Associated Press report from Frankfurt-on-Main, dated September 14, declares that "The German civilian population in the American zone has caused little trouble since Germany's surrender." In other words, the Germans are acting under occupation the way Christians should act. This has come as a never-ending surprise to hate-mongering columnists who predicted the same bloody terrorism from the Germans they had so unscrupulously fanned among the French under German occupation, in whom they called "patriotism" what in the Germans they thought of as "terrorism."

If the Germans are acting with Christian obedience and with becoming cooperation under enemy occupation, it is perhaps because they have assimilated the spirit of Goethe under Napoleon's occupation. Goethe not only refused to become a saboteur, or to join underground resistance movements, but he also and further refused to lend his poetic powers to atrocity mongering and hate propaganda. He remained eminently the kind of German we want all Germans to be, now that we are sitting as an army of occupation upon them.

Many People Thought Goethe a Collaborator

But people in Goethe's day were no more fair or Christian than they are today. Just as Frenchmen who obeyed German occupation rules in our day were called collaborators and traitors by their fellow Frenchmen and their alleged friends, so his fellow Germans, in various underground movements, maligned Goethe for refusing to hate and sabotage the enemy.

To his very death, many people remembered his pacific meekness during the French occupation and remained unreconciled to him because of it. In March, 1832, the month of his death, Eckermann records Goethe's saying that he knew people criticized him, hard though he had toiled all his life:

" . . . just because I have disdained to mingle in political parties. To please such people I must have become a member of a Jacobin club, and preached bloodshed and murder."

Goethe Insisted Good in Enemy Must Be Recognized

Even in his dying weeks, thinking of the narrow nationalism of people continued to disturb him. He expressed the fear

that "this wretched subject" will make him "unwise in railing against folly." He declares emphatically that love of country must not blind a man to the good of other countries, even during war. A good man's real love will be the good everywhere rather than the selfish welfare of only one province or country. He affirms that "The poet, as a man and citizen, will love his native land" but that his real and greater love "is the good, noble, and beautiful, which is confined to no particular province or country." Referring to the anti-Napoleonic war propaganda, he commented:

"If a poet would work politically he must bid farewell to his free spirit, his unbiased view, and draw over his ears the cap of bigotry and blind hatred."

Clearly Goethe would not stoop to lie about his country's enemy or to slander him.

Culture of Other Side Must Be Honored

He was even more specific two years previously (*Conversations with Eckermann*, March 14, 1830). Answering the reproach that he had not become a war propagandist in the German War of Liberation against Napoleon, brought against him by his countrymen, he exclaimed:

"How could I write songs of hatred without hating! And between ourselves, I did not hate the French, although I thanked God that we were free from them. How could I, to whom culture and barbarism are alone of importance, hate a nation which is among the most cultivated of the earth, and to which I owe so great a part of my culture?"

This is the most remarkable statement on record of fair-mindedness towards a country's enemy. It was made after that enemy had conquered his native land and had for years occupied, plundered and humiliated it, and after that enemy had finally been driven out and totally defeated. Its warm and first glory lies in the near-miracle (for it happens so rarely) that in the hate hysteria of war and with the atrocities incident to all wars and parties, Goethe determinedly remembered that the foe, the French in this case, had a high culture.

One American Also Big Enough to Honor German Culture

One is happy to note that in this war one American, Sumner Welles in *Time for Decision*, despite his caveman ethics with regard to a defeated nation's right to national unity, has not allowed himself to become hate-blinded to the like truth about the Germans. He says of them, of these "Germanic peoples" whom he proposes to Balkanize, that:

" . . . it is a singular fact that no people contributed more to the philosophic, scientific, literary, and musical heritage of modern civilization."

He continues, "The 'Elysian fields of Weimar' are peopled with those whose genius brought about the culmination of the Romantic movement. The German universities, still vibrant with the vital forces which originated in the liberal movements of the early nineteenth century, seemed to hold the promise of becoming the source of inspiration for the new intellectual Renaissance. And in the field of municipal government, the Germans set a high standard of efficiency and of civic responsibility which, as an example, proved of material benefit to many other countries" (*Omnibook Abridgement*, November 1944, p. 95).

But This American Not Big Enough to Propose Just Peace

Here Sumner Welles resembles the great Goethe who could say of his country's enemy, "How could I . . . hate a nation which is among the most cultivated of the earth," only while Mr. Welles is scientific enough to recognize the opponent's culture, his criminally unjust peace proposals make it appear that he cannot similarly emulate Goethe's conquest of hate. To grasp how uniquely Christian Goethe's fairmindedness towards the French was, one merely has to recall that the English at this same time, though they had not been thrown out of their beds by drunken French soldiers as Goethe had, represented Napoleon "as a baby-eating monster" (J. M. Read, *Atrocity Propaganda*, New Haven, 1941, p. 3).

In spite of the dreadful sufferings the French had inflicted on his country and of the indignities he himself suffered, he remained big enough not to hate the French. Better still, when the Germans and their Allies finally overwhelmed the French at Leipzig and at Waterloo, he did not in a blind lust for re-

venge and power politics advocate the dismemberment of France, or its de-industrialization, or the robbery of some of its best territories and the expulsion of its peoples, or the wholesale execution of its government and army officials as war criminals.

"National Hatred Is Something Peculiar"

On the contrary, he rose to the high Christian concept of feeling ". . . the weal and woe of a neighboring people as if it happened to be one's own." He wrote:

"Altogether, national hatred is something peculiar. You will find it strongest and most violent where there is the lowest degree of culture. But there is a degree where it vanishes altogether, and where one stands to a certain extent above nations, and feels the weal and woe of a neighboring people as if it happened to one's own. This degree of culture was conformable to my nature, and I had become strengthened in it long before I had reached my sixtieth year.' [His age at the time of the French occupation.]

Yes, "national hatred is something peculiar"! Jingoism, extreme nationalism, peculiar, alas, but not rare. The barbarians in every land feel them more intensely than do the saints. Dr. Max Jordan, interviewing Therese Neumann, stigmatic of Konnersreuth, shortly after American troops occupied her destroyed village, records no outburst of hatred on her part. Instead she said:

"Now we must all bear the trials and sufferings of these times patiently and offer them up in reparation for the many sins committed these past years" (*Tablet*, May 12, 1945).

May the Victors Soon Be Ashamed of Their Injustices

But unfortunately there are few saints and few Goethes. Too many of the others, if they are losers, want to meet their "trials and sufferings," as we told the French and Poles to meet them, with time bombs and sabotage. And if they are winners they lust to reduce the vanquished to slave labor, to loot and starve them, to rob and dismember their lands and deport their populations. Yet the Pope in his Peace Day Address of May 9, 1945, said:

"The war has aroused everywhere discord, suspicion and hatred. If, therefore, the world wishes to regain peace, it is necessary that falsehood and rancor should vanish and in their stead that sovereign truth and charity should reign."

Those words of justice, charity, and brotherhood are exactly what the greatest poet of the Germans practiced one hundred thirty-three years ago. May God grant that his sore-pressed countrymen of today may remain noble enough to do so, too, may continue to "bear the trials and sufferings of these times patiently," as one of them prayed—and may God grant, we pray earnestly, that the victors may soon be ashamed of their hatreds and blind injustices, their dismemberments and expulsions and de-industrializations, and come back to the principles of the Atlantic Charter so shamefully betrayed at Yalta and at Potsdam.

Chapter IX

A JUST, OR MERELY AN ENFORCED PEACE

God would be a monster if He permitted an unjust peace to last. Yet an unjust peace, presided over by the gangsters who divided the spoils, is what Lend-Leaser Roosevelt sold the American people. Now the gangsters who at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam arranged for the territorial robbery, the expulsion, the de-industrialization and mass starvation of the vanquished, and who stood by to let hundreds of thousands of German, Austrian, and Hungarian women be raped, and who promised to keep such a peace forever by force of their arms, are beginning to arm against one another. This article, written after President Roosevelt's Peace-by-force speech of Christmas, 1943, and the Pope's Peace-through-justice address of the same date, contrasts the two viewpoints. It suggests that nations which try to enforce an unjust peace against the vanquished deserve to cut their own throats over the spoils—and probably will. This was written in 1944 for a Catholic magazine, but not published because it was not its policy "to question so pointedly the good motives of the Administration." American papers never hesitated to question the good motives of the Axis governments, only to find now that they are beginning to say the same things about most of Hitler's enemies which Goebbels said about them.

On Christmas Eve, 1943, two extremely important and significant messages were given to the world, one by President Roosevelt, the other by Pope Pius. Both of them sounded like a forecast of peace in 1944, and both of them were shadowed by the fear that the peace might not be a good one. Each one's approach to a good peace was different.

Roosevelt Talks of an Enforced, the Pope of a Just Peace

The New York Times in its headlines, reporting the messages, in two words hit this difference. It headlined the President's message as, "Roosevelt Promises Nation a Durable Peace," and the Pope's as, "Pope Prays for Just Peace by Wise Use of Force." In other words, the President promised the world a durable peace, while the Pope begged for a just peace.

While the President makes six references to a durable peace and to a peace kept by force, and only one, rather submerged one to "winning a just peace that will last for generations," the Pope makes not one single direct reference to a durable peace with

only one allusion to it in the phrase that "a peace built on wrong foundations" will be "therefore ephemeral and illusory." With not one direct reference to a durable peace, the Pope makes eight strong references to a just peace.

It is almost as if the Pope had noted with alarm that Anglo-American peace promises are more and more stressing an enforced and durable peace and soft-pedalling former assurances of a just peace. Since Russia has evidenced its demand for the Baltic states and a part of Poland, this shift from justice to durableness has quietly been gaining.

Roosevelt Likes the Words "Durable" and "Enforced"

In his Christmas message, the President said that he and Churchill and Stalin had frankly discussed "every conceivable subject connected with the winning of the war and the establishment of a durable peace after the war." The word just precisely where in connection with Stalin it would have been most reassuring, is missing. Again and again he speaks of keeping a peace by force without any reference to a just peace. He speaks of the four great military nations sticking together in the "determination to keep the peace," and says, "we are agreed that if force is necessary to keep international peace, international force will be applied." He says again that the four great nations "are in complete agreement that we must be prepared to keep the peace by force."

In the following statement the word "just" could most naturally have been inserted and seems almost deliberately to be omitted:

(Speaking of the peoples of the world) "Most of them are fighting for the attainment of peace—not just a truce, not just an armistice—but peace that is strongly enforced and as durable as mortal man can make it."

From the omission of the word just in every one of the considered and significant references to peace one cannot escape the conclusion that the President is trying to make the people more concerned with a permanent peace than with a just one. His one allusion to a just peace occurs in the perorational and grooved phrase that our first and foremost task is that of "winning the war and winning a just peace that will last for generations."

Actually even the pre-Pearl Harbor promises of a permanent peace have been toned down to durable merely for some generations. A careful and analytical reading of the President's message really is a persuasion of the people to settle for a peace durable for several generations rather than hope for one that will last indefinitely, and more importantly to settle for a peace that is reasonably durable because enforced by the military power of the four largest nations of the earth even if not acceptable by everybody as just.

But the Pope Likes the Words "Moral and Juridical"

As against the promise of such a peace, a peace durable but not necessarily just, the Pope raises almost an agonized cry. He almost says, Better no peace, than an unjust peace. He cries out against "the unspeakable catastrophe of a peace built on wrong foundations." He says:

"this hour demands, with insistent voice, that the aims and programs for peace be inspired by the highest moral sense. They should have as their supreme purpose nothing less than the task of securing agreement and concord between the warring nations."

In other words, he implores against a peace made acceptable to the loser merely by the point of the gun of the stronger. He wants a peace of "agreement and concord." This means a peace that is talked over and discussed and proven reasonable by facts, not by bombs. A peace arrived at by "concord and agreement" is not a knock-down peace resulting from unconditional surrender.

The Pope wants "a peace over whose cradle the vengeful lightning of hate and the instincts of unchecked desire for vengeance do not flash." He wants a peace not arrived at as "the mathematical result of a proportion of forces," but "a moral and juridical" peace. He would appear to be against a peace achieved by saying, We want you to accept this because we have the biggest guns; he would appear to want a peace achieved by saying, We want you to accept this because we can convince you that it is just.

He says emphatically:

"a real peace in conformity with the dignity of man and the Christian conscience can never be a harsh imposition supported by arms, but rather is the result

of a provident justice and a responsible sense of equity toward all."

But the whole burden of Mr. Roosevelt's message is that "Britain, Russia, China and the United States and their allies represent more than three-quarters of the total population of the earth," and if these stick together "there will be no possibility of an aggressor nation arising to start another world war."

Pope Allows Force Only for Justice Not to Maintain Injustice

Whereas the President throughout speaks of military force in order to maintain the peace against any nation that is dissatisfied, the Pope gives a radically different function to the use of force. The Pope says the business of force must be to see that justice is done. He says:

"A true peace . . . is not, in fact, achieved without the employment of force, and its very existence needs the support of a normal measure of power. But the real function of this force, if it is to be morally correct, should consist in protecting and defending and not lessening or suppressing rights."

Rightly interpreted, this means that the military power of the Allies in the twenties and thirties should not have been used to make the unjust Versailles treaty stick but in enforcing against whoever was obstinate an adjustment in line with justice. If the Ruhr District, as is now commonly admitted, really ought to have been German, then the Anglo-American power should not have been used to keep Hitler from taking it by force but to make France give it to Germany so that he would not have had to take it by force. It also should have been used to help the Danzigers rejoin Germany instead of promoting a World War to prevent it!

The Pope here is really expressing a very radical concept. The President and countless other Anglo-American humanitarians have consistently expressed the view that in a war he is the criminal who first uses force no matter how great the injustice against which he uses it. It is a perverted sort of pacifism. The Pope makes it clear that the international force, whatever its origin, is to be used to enforce justice, not to enforce peace at the cost of justice.

Victors Should Worry as Much About Their Own Guilt as About the Loser's

The Pope in his 1943 Christmas message lays down another extremely significant and radical principle for deciding what is justice in making a peace. He of course warns against all the ordinary, often expressed but still too little heeded pitfalls of a just peace. He warns the leaders of the victorious powers to rise "above every boast of military superiority." This means that might must not be thought to make right, a principle with which Mr. Roosevelt certainly agrees. Mr. Roosevelt in his message declares that "The doctrine that the strong shall dominate the weak . . . we reject." But the Pope further asks the victorious leaders to rise "above every one-sided affirmation of right and justice." Here is implied a real jolt to the Anglo-American thinking which put the disastrous guilt clause into the Versailles Treaty. It means that the peace must be based on justice, not on punishment, and if there is justice then who was to blame has nothing to do with the peace. A boundary belongs where it belongs regardless of who started a war or is supposed to have started it.

Roosevelt Sinks Justice in the You-Are-Guilty Complex

The Pope's no-guilt-clause attitude is hard on We-Holy-Big-Four Roosevelt. His message is still suffused with insistence on the other side's guilt. He talks of "an aggressor nation arising to start another world war," and of "the past years of international gangsterism and brutal aggression," and of making the Germans respectable and ridding them of Nazism and Prussian militarism. But the Pope warns the victorious leaders in the consciousness of their power to rise above the "question of guilty responsibility for the present war and the demand for reparations." In the beginning of his message he even suggests that both sides should consider themselves equally to blame. He says in this war "the words of wisdom are fulfilled: 'They were all bound together with one chain of darkness.'"

Pope Warns Against Reparations

As in the quotation above so in others indirectly the Pope warns against exacting reparations. Passionately he begs even those who suffered much injustice in the war that they "must not tomorrow stain the peace and repay injustice with injustice,

or commit an even greater injustice." He begs against treating any nation "in a manner contrary to justice, equity and prudence." This recalls to us the Versailles demand of reparations which even the makers of the Versailles Peace a few years later recognized as impossible.

The Pope's Master Principle for a Just Peace

But the Pope goes beyond all these principles and recommendations for a just peace. He enunciates a master principle for a just peace, one which, though commonly accepted for individuals, has never been pronounced as acceptable between victorious and vanquished nations.

Addressing the victorious nations in the "consciousness" of their power, he states:

"Do not ask from any member of the family of peoples, however small or weak, for the renunciation of substantial rights or vital necessities which you yourselves, if it were demanded of your people, would deem impracticable."

In other words, as between individuals, so between nations, let no nation do to another what it would consider unjust if done to itself. The Pope speaks of "substantial rights or vital necessities," and so leaves some leeway to interpretations and minor injustices. But the whole spirit of the statement is that the victorious nations should not do to the vanquished what they would rightly consider unjust if done to them. This is a tremendously hard saying. It ought of course to be obvious and natural. But where justice is concerned, mankind does not see the obvious and, finally seeing it, is still too hardened in its heart immediately to practice it.

If Germany Did It To Us!

A few hints as to what this principles means. If Germany won, and determined to break our union (finally achieved by force in the Civil War) into component parts, we would consider it unjust, completely unjust. If Germany won and decided that we had to get rid of our form of government, we would consider it completely unjust. If Germany won and decided to reorganize our school system and to supervise it with a view to inculcating her own political ideas, we would consider it terribly unjust. If Germany won and decided to break up our

industries so as never to be her international commercial competitor, we would consider it terribly and essentially unjust.

Roosevelt Wants to Sit on Vanquished—and Keep Them Free Too

Mr. Roosevelt, too, though he insists on a peace enforced by the Big Four, declares that their force must not be used to dominate or enslave any of the other nations. He says,

"The rights of every nation, large or small, must be respected and guarded as jealously as are the rights of every individual within our own republic."

This is certainly a commendable and fair-minded declaration. He even specifies that "The United Nations have no intention to enslave the German people," and continues:

"We wish them to have a normal chance to develop, in peace, as useful and respectable members of the European family."

This sounds very hopeful and is indeed a great improvement over Mr. Roosevelt's unconditional-surrender and war-criminal-prosecution demands. Nevertheless, Mr. Roosevelt attaches qualifications and prescriptions which may not fit so easily into the Pope's master prescription for a just peace.

Mr. Roosevelt's prescription, (along with his intention not to enslave the German people), for enforcing a "durable" peace is the

"determination that Germany must be stripped of her military might and be given no opportunity within the foreseeable future to regain that might."

He also requires that before the Germans are to be given "a normal chance to develop," they rid themselves of Nazism, Prussian militarism, and their "Master Race" notion. For Japan he prescribes "the permanent elimination of the Empire of Japan as a potential force of aggression."

We Can't Justly Keep Vanquished Down

Now the question arises, Can these things be done justly? Can these things be done without doing to the vanquished what we would consider unjust if it would be done to us were we vanquished? How, for example, is Japan to be permanently

eliminated as "a potential force of aggression"? She must be permanently kept stripped of a fleet, for even one battleship could aggress against Pearl Harbor. She must be kept stripped of an air fleet. She must be kept stripped of an army. Not just for the next five years, for Mr. Roosevelt says, permanently. Can this be done without quartering troops and agents on Japan? And if so, would that be consistent with her freedom and sovereignty? Specifically, to apply the Pope's master principle, would we consider it just and fair, were we to lose, if Japan made it her point to deprive us of an army and a fleet and an airforce for the next five, twenty-five, fifty, hundred, five hundred years—permanently, in other words? To keep Japan from ever being a potential aggressor again, would it not be necessary to supervise, or altogether eliminate her chemical and heavy industries? And if that were done to us, would we consider that just?

If the Germans insisted on eliminating Britain permanently as a potential aggressor, would they not have to strip her of Hong Kong and Gibraltar, and the Suez Canal, and very much else beside? Would Britain consider that just? Would we consider it just? If the Germans said to Britain, No more navy for you forever, would we consider that just?

It is clear, therefore, even in a matter that is quite glibly assumed to be all right when done to the other fellow, a clash with justice occurs. If the Germans forever forced disarmament upon us while they themselves kept armed we would say they were enslaving us.

May White Southerners Be Enslaved for Feeling Superior to Negroes?

The President says the Germans are to be given a normal chance to develop only after they have given up their Master Race notions. Our Southerners still generally have the notion that "Negroes are all right in their place." Even the Civil War did not knock the white superiority idea out of them. Would it have been considered just for the North to keep on quartering troops on them, and denying them their free state governments, and curtailing their industries until such a time as they got over their false race notion?

If Axis War Criminals Are Punished, All War Criminals Must Be Punished

These are serious questions. The President in previous speeches spoke of the absolute requirement of punishing Axis war criminals, including especially those who allegedly started the war. If Hitler must be hanged for invading Poland, is it understood that Stalin must also be hanged for having invaded Finland? This is also a serious question. The Pope seems to be quite clear in his statement that just as between individuals so between nations, Don't do to others what you would not have them do to you. President Roosevelt's Christmas message, however, emphatically promises us an enforced peace, sat on by us and Britain and Russia and China. And the stated terms of that enforcement are not such as we would consider just if applied to us. That is why the Pope decries a dictated and a forced peace and instead says that the supreme purpose of the peacemakers must be "nothing less than the task of securing agreement and concord between the warring nations." We cannot and must not expect "agreement and concord" from the Axis nations to anything to which we would not agree ourselves if demanded of us.

Chapter X

THE FLY IN PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S TWELVE PEACE POINTS

This article was written November 24, 1946, but not published. It points out the fatal weakness of Mr. Truman's widely acclaimed foreign policy pronouncement of October 27, 1945. His peace points, however innocent and even noble they sound, are really the rules of an alliance, a gangster pact to get along at the expense and exploitation of those not in the gang. As a pronouncement of Christian statesmanship, their exclusion of the vanquished in the most important of points—territories and raw materials—makes them not only worthless but vicious. By September 6, 1946, when Secretary of State Byrnes spoke in Stuttgart, Germany, our government had very belatedly, after enormous harm has been done learned, "that our peace and well-being cannot be purchased at the price of peace or the well-being of any other country," meaning specifically, Germany, the special victim of the harsh-peace savages.

On Navy Day, October 27, 1945, President Truman announced a twelve-point program of foreign policy. To many it seemed a splendid development of Wilson's Fourteen Points and Roosevelt's Atlantic Charter. In this country and England it was widely acclaimed as just, practical, and noble. It has been called a reaffirmation of Christian policy from which at Yalta and Potsdam we had been tragically deflected.

Most of the Twelve Points Are Good

In truth most of the twelve points are splendid. Yet they unfortunately contain one provision or qualification under which all the injustices of Yalta and Potsdam can find sanction and which essentially sweeps the whole program from the hill tops of Christianity into the swamps of paganism.

That good points are that we ourselves "seek no territorial expansion or selfish advantage"; that we want sovereign rights and self-government restored or given to all peoples deprived of them; that we want freedom of the seas for all nations; that we want "full economic collaboration between all nations, great

and small"; and that the nations of the Western hemisphere "without interference from outside the Western hemisphere, must work together as good neighbors."

Bad: Justice Only "In Any Friendly Part of the World"

The paganizing qualification, implied also in three other points (8, 11, and 12), occurs in Point 3: "We shall approve no territorial changes in any friendly part of the world unless they accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned." Here the words in any friendly part of the world carry the proposition right back into the paganism from which Christianity in its 1945 years has painstakingly tried to lift the world. The proposition means that we shall want justice done to any nation we rate as our friend, but that territorial injustices committed against people we don't like or don't consider friends are all right. Because the ancient German province of East Prussia is part of a country with which we were at war, says the proposition in effect, it has no territorial rights and we can approve its being ripped off and given to Russia.

Violates Wilson's "Impartial Justice"

How seriously this proposition—territorial justice only for friends—graphs our moral crash in the last generation becomes painfully obvious by a comparison with the first of Wilson's Five Particulars. On September 27, 1918, he said:

"The impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just. It must be justice that plays no favorites and knows no standards but the equal rights of the several peoples concerned."

Wilson did not restrict just dealings to any friendly part of the world. On the contrary he very specifically, knowing the pagan viciousness of man, declared that what precisely is important is being just to the nations we don't like—our so-called enemies.

No Virtue in Being Just Only to Friends

And it is exactly that point that marks the distinction between paganism and Christianity. It is this point of being just, not merely to our friends but to our enemies, that Christ constantly hammered home as the indispensable essence of Christ-

ianity. In His great Sermon on the Mount, Christ says with burning seriousness:

"You have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thy enemy. But I say to you, Love your enemies; do good to them that hate you: and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you."

Then He becomes more specific and adds that if they want to be children of God they must be as just to good and bad, friend and foe, as the sun shines on both alike. "Do good to them that hate you," He says,

"That you may be the children of your Father who is in heaven, who maketh his sun to rise upon the good and bad, and raineth upon the just and the unjust."

Thereupon he draws the crucial distinction between paganism and Christianity, that one is good and just among its own gang, its own clique, but that the other is good and just to everybody. He declares,

"For if you love them that love you, what reward shall you have? do not even the publicans this?"

And if you salute your brethren only, what do you more? do not also the heathens this?" (Matthew, ch. 5).

Gang Justice is Jungle Justice

Yet Mr. Truman in his Twelve Points announces that we reject territorial injustices only in any friendly part of the world, that we insist on justice only for our own gang, our own clique. This is pointedly and exactly what Christ declared the heathens to do and from which the Christians must go to include everybody in every part of the world.

Elsewhere, in the Gospel according to Saint Luke, Christ is still more pointed in declaring that if we are merely just to those of our own clique we are no better than sinners, that as Christian we must treat friend and foe in matters of justice exactly alike, just as the rain falls on both, and that that standard is doing to others just as we want others to do to us, not as we think others would do to us, but as we would want them to do us. After repeating, "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you," Christ declares,

"And as you would that men should do to you, do you also to them in like manner.

And if you do good to them who do good to you, what thanks are to you? for sinners also do this" (Luke, ch. 6).

Christian America Must "Hunger" to be Just to Germans, Italians, and Japanese

And how resolved must we be to do this kind of justice to those whom we do not like, to those "to whom," as Wilson said, "we do not wish to be just"? The answer is we must be determined to be just to our enemies—that means, in the present peace, the Germans, Japanese, and Italians—to the point of hungering and thirsting after such justice, more than that, virtually to the point of suffering persecution for such justice, for Christ says,

"Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice... Blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

This justice is not restrictable to any friendly part of the world, or, as in Mr. Truman's Point 8, to all states which are accepted in the society of nations; it applies fully and absolutely to all people and all nations all the time. The law and the prophets, says Christ, is that "whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them." Christ did not add any postscript to the effect that if anytime in history America, Russia, and Britain should be especially chummy, and if, as even among thieves generally, their chumminess can best be promoted by an extra large pile of spoils and booty that then it will be all right for America to let dear Brother Stalin loot Austria, Hungary, and Eastern Germany of factories, machinery, and even household furnishings, and to tear four provinces away from Germany, to rob the nine million people living there of goods, cattle, and money, even most of their clothes, and then to drive them like evil beasts out of their ancient homelands to starve and freeze by the roadsides—the children to die, the women to be raped!

President Truman Makes America Approve Injustices to Vanquished

This is what Time Magazine calls emerging "from history's most terrible war, into history's most terrifying peace." This robbery of provinces and the looting and expulsion of nine

million peoples is a logical consequence of restricting justice to any friendly part of the world. But it is not Christian. It is pagan and mosaic. It is a monstrous crime. Speaking of the duties towards the vanquished of occupying armies and nations in war and during reconstruction Pius XII said on June 2, 1940,

"Justice and equity require that they be treated in the same manner as, under similar circumstances, the occupying power should wish to see its own citizens treated."

Tearing their homelands from millions, looting them of even their personal possessions, then driving them out to hunger and starve is not the way we should want to be treated—but because our beloved Allies, according to our approved Yalta and Potsdam agreements, are doing this in a part of the world not friendly, we approve it. President Truman, according to an AP dispatch (Oct. 9), "declared that there never has been a clash of American and Russian interests and expressed hope there never would be."

Justice Restricted to Own Gang is Gangsterism

Restricting justice to any friendly part of the world in territorial matters is restricting it in effect in all matters, as the terrors in East Prussia and Silesia and Austria indicate. But more than that. When decency and justice are declared to obtain only for those in our own gang, justice and decency lose their effectiveness entirely. This is why Mr. Truman's seemingly nice Twelve Points are so ruinously evil because of their discrimination "between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just."

If territorial injustice must be avoided only among friends, and may be perpetrated towards non-friends we are morally speaking, and politically speaking, again in the jungle. Indeed, the jungle law, implicit in Mr. Truman's Points, has already functioned with regard to Poland. When Russia wanted a slice of Polish territory, Poland was in Mr. Truman's friendly part of the world and so Russia was debarred from grabbing it. But Russia wanted it nonetheless, as it may want the Dardanelles and the Italian colonies, and someday possibly Alaska.

Our Gangster Principles Have Already Begun to "Pay Off"

According to Mr. Truman's Twelve Points, what therefore was Russia's logical procedure to get this Polish territory without violating any "principles"? The procedure is and was quite simple. Russia simply declared the Polish government in London unfriendly, and then proceeded to rob this Polish territory, just as, because we have declared the German government unfriendly, we authorized her to rob, as Churchill figures it, one fourth of Germany's arable land. Russia is quite in order. It is Mr. Truman's Twelve Points which are out of order. A principle either applies to friend and foe—or "the principle" is a jungle implement.

When a nation starts converting the Sermon-on-the-Mount principles into jungle implements, it will get caught in the jungle, or under an atomic bomb. Principles are things one either lives up to or gets crushed by. And if one serpent-like tries to pervert them one will be strangled by them. Restricting territorial justices to any friendly part of the world is a horrid perversion of Christian principle. The jungle implement that it spewed has already been used to destroy Poland, to convert Germany into a "tragedy on a prodigious scale," and sometime when Russia, logically using it, will declare Turkey unfriendly and take the Dardanelles, we will be shocked and exclaim against Russia's wickedness. But when still another time, Russia or someone should declare us or our government unfriendly and proceed to take Alaska, or Pearl Harbor, then our boys will again be sent to die, ostensibly to recover a principle which we ourselves, in our lust for a harsh rather than a just peace, had perverted into a jungle implement.

Chapter XI

COOPERATING WITH RUSSIA BY DOUBLE-CROSSING SMALL PEOPLES

This article was written shortly after Secretary Byrnes returned from the late 1945 Moscow conference where this government of ours, which preferred a World War to letting the Danzigers return to Hitler's Germany, condemned some more territories to Soviet rape and loot. The point of the article has lately been expressed by John Foster Dulles (LIFE, June 3 and 10; READER'S DIGEST, August, 1946) when he says, "The fact is that our war and post-war diplomacy, as a whole, makes it natural for Soviet leaders to feel that we are insincere. Often . . . we have abandoned the very principles which, when it seems to serve our convenience, we invoke against the Soviet Government. For example, we bartered away to the Soviet Union the rights of weak nations, as China and Poland, despite the Atlantic Charter. We have, in Germany, shared in policies and practices which are inhuman and unjust . . ."

When Secretary of State Byrnes returned at Christmas (1945) from his Moscow Conference, the press releases cooed, turtle dove, at the "cordially warm relations" established between Byrnes, Bevins, and Molotov. Many newspapers and all the fellows who back in 1939 shouted that England, France and we should rather go to war than let the Danzigers go back to Hitler's Germany now purred that Secretary of State Byrnes had since the disrupted London Conference in October become a good little boy who smiles and says "yes" to Russia and so gets along wonderfully, not like at the London Conference when he dared to say "no" so that all the little nations smiled—but Molotov walked out!

To Please Soviets We Make Roast Pig Out of Korea

News of the Moscow appeasement-fest had hardly transpired when this headline appeared, "Koreans Angered by Deal at Moscow. Stone U. S. Soldiers, Start Civil War." Apparently we had once again sat down to a love-feast with Russia at which a weak nation was the roast pig! In 1942 when Russia was yowling for a Second Front, Roosevelt and Churchill proclaimed as a war aim that Korea must be torn from Japan

and given independence. What the Koreans got after Japan surrendered was Communist Russian occupation of the northern half of the country (with Americans occupying the southern half).

This "split," says Time (Oct. 8, 1945) "along the 38th parallel is Korea's biggest, most galling problem . . . The Russians are strictly business-like in occupying what was enemy territory. Their attitude towards civilians is: 'Give us what we want and keep the hell out of our way.' They brought fine weapons but few supplies, and they are living off the country. That probably stimulates the impression of widespread looting." In other words, we "liberated" Korea from the Japanese, who, incidentally, "had organized this country thoroughly . . . into a working economic entity" (Time, Ibid.), in order to hand half of it to the Bolsheviks to loot, sack, and bolshevize!

What Right Have We to Give Other Nation's Land to Russia?

- What right had we to do this? And now, it seems, our Secretary of State went to Moscow to further Russian-American cooperation by making all of Korea a part-Russian trusteeship. During the war we pledged Korea independence; in the peace we collaborate it into Russian hands! Truly, here is a policy of cooperation by the double cross—cooperation with the world's worst totalitarian, and double cross of the world's little peoples!

In Iran we seem to have done something similar. Turkey hears Pravda, looks at our "cooperating" face, and trembles. Stalin says, "I don't like the government of Spain," and our government boys rush up and cry, "We'll see, Boss, if we can't smear it, or blow it, or boycott it out of existence for you!" What a pathetic roll call of double-crossed little nations we are inscribing on the scroll of history! Every time our government boys confer with Stalin and Molotov, we wax to new warmths of "cordiality" by jointly placing a funeral wreath on another valiant little people's rights. It started with brave little Finland, whose ambassador Roosevelt invited "out" when his honest little country, remembering that Roosevelt's speech writer had cheered it with "There Shall Be No Night," thought it honorable not to pay enormous reparations for the "tragedy"

of having been twice brutally attacked by Russia or to connive in the violation of the Atlantic Charter by surrendering a huge slice of its homeland to Russia!

We Double-Cross Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland

It continued in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. In the case of Poland, it finally created a scandal which smelled in the nostrils of all decent men around the world—but not in those of our “world-liberating” interventionists. They calmly suggested that the double cross of Poland be blurred by another double cross of the self-determination rights of the little peoples of East Prussia, Pomerania, and Silesia. Now Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, and nearly half of Germany have been taken over by the Russians, while President Truman proclaims how wonderfully the Russians cooperate with us and expresses “concern that Russia has been badly misrepresented in this country” (AP, Oct. 9, 1945)!

Last spring, near Berlin we stopped our troops so that the Russians would get in first. After they had looted and sacked the city worse than the Vandals of old, and had violated all the available women, the Russians let us occupy a section of the thoroughly sacked city, whereupon our officials waxed warm about Russian cooperation! In November 1944, the American bishops cried out against the “frightful barbarities” committed by the Russians “in Poland, the Baltic states, and neighboring Catholic lands.”

When We Hand Russia Lands We Condemn Women to be Outraged

That is the ghastliest part of the story. When we connive to let the Russians occupy territory, it is not as if American or British or German troops occupied it. The Germans, for example, while they put saboteurs and resistance leaders into concentration camps, did not rape or loot, but practiced “a sort of correctness in dealing with the people.” A member of an American investigating committee in France, President Frederick C. Crawford of Thompson Products, reported (Jan. 4, 1945) “that if a citizen attended strictly to business and took no political or underground action against the occupying [German] army, he was treated with correctness.”

Wherever the Russians have not kept Americans from seeing for themselves (as in Poland and Russia), that seems to be the essential truth. William Shirer, following the German occupation of Paris, reported in his *Berlin Diary* for June 16, 1940, that

“It seems the Parisians actually believed the Germans would rape the women . . . They had heard fantastic tales . . . The ones who stayed are all the more amazed at the very correct behavior of the troops so far.”

Where the Germans Respected Women, Our Ally Raped 100,000 in One City Alone

As against such comparatively correct behavior by American, British, and German occupying troops, as observed by trained American reporters, Archbishop (now Cardinal) Bernard Griffin of England, after a visit to Central Europe, “described ‘the horrible facts’ of violation of women and looting by the Russians. In Vienna 100,000 women have been violated, not once but many times, including girls not yet in their teens” (NC, London, Oct., 1945). Vienna, a Christian city, was one we claimed we had to “liberate”!

Such raping and looting is the story for Berlin, and Danzig, and Budapest, and even for pro-Russian Czechoslovakia. Time Magazine (Oct. 22, 1945) reported that “a summer of Red Army occupation had brought disillusionment and uneasiness . . . Some troopers acted like rustic louts—Stalin is said to have apologized to Benes.” Acting like “rustic louts” is a euphemism Russia-appeasers use to describe looting and raping when the Russians do it.

The looting of homes, the violation of women, the deportation and often murder of non-communists and of clergymen, the bolshevizing of property are the crimes our government connives at everytime it cooperates with Russia by double-crossing any other nation. Some of these crimes are irreparable. A woman violated is violated forever. After a few months of Russian occupation the damage is done—dead men stay dead, starved children are destroyed, and violated women, even if they live, have suffered what used to be called “a fate worse than death” and what no American would stand by to connive at!

**Not War with Russia is Needed But Delousing Our
Government of Unprincipled Scoundrels**

People, frightened by government insinuations, cry, "But what can we do? Surely you do not want war with Russia!" But there is no question of war with Russia. The question is, Should we keep conniving with the bolshevizing of Europe and Asia, OR, Should we start protesting against it? Recently Patrick J. Hurley, long respected diplomat, charged that "A considerable section of our State Department is endeavoring to support Communism generally as well as specifically in China." That is what the real trouble seems to be—not fear of war with Russia, but a determined Communistic Fifth Column, not only among our publicists but even among our present government, which openly applauds and secretly seems to work for every Stalinist encroachment against small nations and weak peoples—especially if they are Catholic and Christian nations.

Castigating our foolish and unjust concessions to Stalin and Molotov at Moscow, Senator Wheeler said, "Russia does not want war with us and we don't want to have war with Russia—and Russia knows it, so she is taking advantage of that." No, when the most mighty armed nation in the world, as President Truman calls us, in conference after conference, hands one nation after another over to Russian domination and brutality without a protest, but with boasts of cordiality and with praise of Russia's cooperativeness, it isn't fear of war that is at the bottom of it.

**The Lend-Leasers Who Were Swindlers in 1941
Are Double-Crossers Now**

It is something very different. The government that lend-leased us into a war on account of Danzig, that kept screaming against "appeasement" of Hitler's Germany, is not afraid of the Russians, whom before we rushed to their help the Germans drove to the gates of Moscow! What makes out government hand nations and factories and rights to the Russian totalitarianism is the same evil spirit that is worming for the downfall of the governments of Spain and Argentina—whose special characteristics seem to be that they were peaceloving during the war, are opposed to Communism and strongly favor Christianity.

The men who are really behind this perversion of the Atlantic Charter principles in favor of Russia are bolshevizers and de-Christianizers. They want to undermine the Christian order in the world. If they said so openly there would be enough Christians to defeat their satanic purposes. Therefore they do it by saying that we must get along at any price with Communistic Russia to avoid war, while at the same time, they urge warlike policies to destroy the government of Spain, whose real crimes seem to be that it wants communism never again and that it doesn't even appreciate the sort of "democratic" liberation we have achieved for Poland and Austria!

If all right-minded Christians made it clear that they want our government never to sacrifice either principles or nations to Russia, and that when Russia violates either principles or nations our government should firmly protest against it, never connivingly approve of it in treaty or conference, then this shameful double-crossing of little peoples would quickly stop. And this great country would save its honor now, and remove the probability of a war twenty years from now.

Chapter XII

AMERICAN WAR REASONING—1941-46

This was written in 1944 with only some tense and minor verbal changes made October, 1946. Not even the mass looting, the raping and debauching of the conquered women, the deportation of millions, the abuse of German prisoners of war—horrible physical crimes committed by the self-appointed world reformers—so sickeningly establish that we too qualify as “the most pernicious race of little odious vermin that nature ever suffered to crawl upon the surface of the earth,” according to Dean Swift, as our total war prostitution of reasoning powers—vicious war insanity—whereby we see everything we and our allies did in this war as right and even noble, and everything the Germans and Japanese did as wrong and ignoble. This has become “history’s most terrifying peace,” not merely because of what the victors did, but first of all because of what the victors thought and think. The first step to a decent peace, literally, is just thinking, that means, seeing ourselves as others see us, and seeing our former enemies as we ourselves want to be seen. Any American who does not see that Stalin deserves to be hanged for invading Finland at least as much as Hitler for invading Poland, that Roosevelt’s invading Iceland and French North Africa were ethically exactly the same thing as Hitler’s invading Denmark and Norway, any such American is not yet fit for a just peace, and has far too much to do to re-educate himself to worry about re-educating the Germans and Japanese. It is our first moral duty to think JUSTLY about other nations, to see their crimes and their virtues exactly as we see ours, no better and no worse. The following article merely gives a few suggestions. The reader can add a hundred others.

If it was noble for the Russians and Chinese during their retreats to scorch and burn everything, would it not have been equally noble for the Germans to “scorch-earth” everything when they were forced to retreat?

If it was right for Churchill to say that Singapore wouldn’t fall, when he knew it would, wasn’t it also right for Goebbels to say Stalingrad could be held when he knew it couldn’t?

If an American who bombed Rome is a hero, isn’t a German boy who bombed London also a hero?

If it was accounted very despicable for the French to give any part of their fleet to the occupying Germans, wasn’t it equally despicable for the Italians to give their fleet to the occupying Anglo-Americans?

If the Germans who refused to fight were admirable “patriots” weren’t Americans who refused to fight also admirable patriots? Or do we have one brand of patriotism for Germans and another brand for the Anglo-American “super-race”?

If the French girl in Steinbeck’s Moon is Down was noble for plunging scissors into a German soldier whom she granted a visit, wouldn’t it be equally noble for a Prussian girl to plunge a knife into an American boy whom she has encouraged to a date?

If it was noble for American propagandists to inspire French girls to assassinate German soldiers of occupation, wouldn’t it have been equally noble for German propagandists to urge Italian girls to assassinate American soldiers? If not, why not?

If Hitler was to have been hanged for attacking Poland to get Danzig back, why must not Stalin also be hanged for attacking Finland to get the Karelian territory?

If it was noble for Italy, when the military situation was hopeless, to surrender and to collaborate with the occupying enemy, why was it not noble for France, when the military situation was hopeless, to surrender and to collaborate with the occupying enemy?

If Laval of France, for collaborating with the occupying Germans, was a vile Quisling, why wasn’t Badolio for collaborating with the occupying Anglo-Americans a vile Quisling?

If it is our noble responsibility to declare the Koreans independent from Japan, why isn’t it also our noble responsibility to declare the Indians and the Burmese and the Malayans independent from Britain, and the Javanese and Sumatrans independent from the Dutch?

If Mussolini’s entering the war against France on Germany’s side was a vile “stab in the back,” wasn’t Stalin’s entering the war against Japan on America’s side also a vile “stab in the back”?

If while we were a declared neutral it was proper for us to shelter and repair British warships in our ports, wouldn't it also have been proper for Argentina to shelter and repair German warships in her ports?

If it was noble for Polish priests in German-occupied Poland to blow up railroads, wouldn't it have been equally noble for Rhineland priests in early American-occupied Germany to blow up railroads?

If it was a noble and patriotic act for Czechs to assassinate a German officer of occupation, would it not be an equally noble and patriotic act for Bavarians to assassinate an American AMG officer?

If it was justifiable for Americans to execute even the parents who sheltered and comforted enemy submarine saboteurs, weren't the Germans equally justified in executing the men of Lidice who sheltered and hid the murderers of German occupation officers?

If, because we are the strongest nation in the Western Hemisphere, we have the right to declare a Monroe Doctrine over this hemisphere, does not Japan, because she is the strongest nation in East Asia, have the right to declare a Monroe Doctrine for East Asia (Great East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere)? If not, why not?

If, while we were a declared neutral, we had a right to interfere in Yugoslavia and provoke it to fight against Germany will not Germany have the right, if we ever send Marines down there again, to interfere in Nicaragua and provoke them to fight against us?

If we had a right to put American citizens into concentration or relocation camps merely because they had Japanese blood in them, did not Germany have the right to put German citizens into concentration camps merely because they had Jewish blood in them?

If "military necessity," not vandalism, caused us to destroy religious and cultural monuments such as Montecassino, isn't it probable that it was likewise military necessary, and not vandalism, which forced the Germans to destroy some historical and cultural monuments?

If we had a right to occupy Iceland as an outpost of protection, would not Germany have had a right to occupy Newfoundland as an outpost for her protection?

If the Anglo-Americans, as Secretary of the Navy Knox declared, must police the world for the next hundred years, wouldn't Goebbels have been equally justified in declaring that Germany and Japan must police the world for the next hundred years?

If Americans have a right to speak of "The American Century," and "Manifest Destiny," and "policing the world," without making it a German or Japanese duty to cross thousands of miles of ocean to smash us into unconditional surrender, why was it an American duty to smash the Germans into unconditional surrender because they have such songs and sayings as "Deutschland ueber Alles"?

If we insist that we cannot tolerate the Japanese in Cuba because Cuba is too near our shores to let us tolerate a potential enemy there, is not Japan justified in not tolerating us in the Philippine Islands as being too near her shores?

If, as Mr. Roosevelt said, our frontier is the German Rhine, would not the Germans be equally justified in declaring that their frontier is the American Hudson? If not, why not? Is it a question of a super-duper Master race?

If we must have the bulge of Africa for our protection, must not the Germans have the bulge of South America for their protection?

If an Allied victory makes it right to give East Prussia to Poland, wouldn't a German victory have made it right to give Texas to Mexico?

If we had a right to refuse peace to the German people until and unless they revolted from their national socialistic government, would the Germans have had the right to refuse peace to the Russians until they had revolted from their communistic government and to the English until they had revolted from their monarchistic government and to us Americans until we had revolted from our New Deal government?

If our religious leaders were right in urging as a holy crusade our killing of Germans for their "false" political, social, and religious ideas, is it not to be feared that one day they will likewise urge as a holy crusade the killing of Russians for their "false" ideas?

If it took one of our "peace-loving" allies of 1918, Italy, that helped us dictate the Versailles peace to the Germans, only about twenty years to become a "wicked" aggressor nation, how long will it take this time for one of the "peace-loving" Big Four, dictating this second peace, to change from a lamb to a wolf?

APPENDIX

AMERICAN WAR POLICIES AND CATHOLIC TRADITIONS

This article is reprinted from the CATHOLIC WORLD, October, 1944. Most of its suggestions are now too late to prevent "history's most terrifying peace." But in it he who runs may read why it became "history's most terrifying peace." Its recommendations in the matter of reparations and drawing up the final treaties are still pertinent. But as in the other matters so in these too the Catholic traditions will be ignored. And the human agony will be proportionately aggravated. Catholic tradition wants reparations and treaties fixed under the arbitration of neutral powers. But so far the Big Three have even excluded the neutrals from the United Nations Organization, just as they have excluded the pope and as they have excluded God. And "history's most terrifying peace" becomes ever more terrifying. No one should be surprised. Things are as they are because the leaders of the Big Three were not honorable in their intentions during the war, and they aren't honorable in the peace. Unconditional surrenderism was a gangster policy during the war, and it is a gangster policy in the peace. And gangsterism finally leads to a falling out among the gangsters—and the liquidation of one or all of them! But the saddest thing of all is that the Allied church leaders, Catholic and Protestant, supported unconditional surrenderism rather than the Pope's "peace arising from a free and fruitful agreement." They too now profess to be surprised that the unconditional surrenderist bomb they helped place under the peace structure did not explode into sweetness and light!

Until confronted with a bottle of liquor, it is easy to live up to the commandment not to get drunk. Similarly it is easy to support the Church's teachings on war and peace until one is confronted with a war. In the last war faced with this temptation Church leaders in every country, and of every denomination allowed the majesty of Mars to blur their vision of Christ. Raoul de Roussy de Sales, in *The Making of Tomorrow*, 1942, alluding to that phenomenon said that in a war even "the leaders of the Churches are very quick to uphold the nationalist point of view" (p. 15).

In Past Wars Many Theologians Did Not Let Christ Get in the Way of Mars

Indeed, John Eppstein, classic authority on *The Catholic Tradition of the Law of Nations*, 1935, complains even of "the national bias of many Catholic theologians and publicists both before, during and after the Great War," and speaks of "their response to the pacific leadership of the Holy See" as "meagre and indeed contemptible" (p. 129).

If Catholics are to avoid such nationalistic pitfalls this time it will be well constantly to line national war policies up with Catholic or papal traditions. At present the national war policies seem to be total victory at any price, or in the words of one college president, "The present war must be fought through to a complete victory, regardless of the cost and the suffering"; unconditional surrender; a dictated peace imposed by the Big Four; and under no circumstances a negotiated peace.

"Total Victory at Any Price" is an Inadmissible Policy

How does the policy of "total victory at any price" accord with traditional Catholic teachings? The great Dominican counselor of kings, Francis De Vittoria (1480-1546), in his *De Jure Belli*, says that even when one side has a just cause, if "great ills would befall each side by the war, it could not be a just war." He cites "the devastation of many great cities, great slaughter of human beings" as reasons which make it "indubitable that the prince is bound rather to give up his own rights and abstain from war." (Quoted in Eppstein's *Catholic Tradition of the Law of Nations*, p. 196. Subsequent page references will be to the same volume.) The Jesuit Francis Suarez (1548-1617), in *De Potestate Civilis*, says:

"No war is just if the harm which it seems to bring to the State exceeds the benefit or the advantage, even if in other respects titles and reasons for the justice of the war are not lacking" (p. 107).

He goes on to say, "if war is made with advantage to one province or republic but with loss to the world or to Christendom, I think that war would be unjust."

Only Victory at Reasonable Price Justifiable

These statements would seem to indicate that, if to win total victory, "military necessity" would compel more death

and destruction than victory can reasonably be expected to be worth, not only to one's own side but to the world, then such a war becomes unjust.

The Theological Conventus at Fribourg, Switzerland, in 1931, resolved that modern war "of its very nature causes such ruin, material, spiritual, individual, domestic, social and religious, and becomes such a calamity for the whole world, that it ceases to be a means proportioned to the end in view, which is the restoration of peace and a better condition of human order" (p. 140). Here victory-at-any-price would seem to be completely condemned and only victory-at-a-reasonable-price be considered justifiable.

Whether a total victory is priced reasonably if it should cost the life or health of a million of our men and 300 billion dollars and require the killing of millions of women and children in Europe and Asia and the destruction of many things like Monte Cassino which it has taken the whole life of Christendom to build up, may be hard for some to decide. But it is certain that victory-at-any-price is not a slogan Catholic tradition supports. On September 1, 1943, Pope Pius XII, said with regard to conditions now:

"More tormenting than ever, there comes to soften the minds and hearts of men the doubt whether the continuation of hostilities—and of such hostilities—is and can be said to be still in conformity with national interests, or reasonable and justifiable in the light of Christian and human conscience."

The Policy of Unconditional Surrender

Another war policy is that of demanding unconditional surrender. This means that we refuse to tell our antagonists what satisfactions we want of them but insist on slaughtering them until they abjectly put themselves and all they have completely at our disposal. Applicable to this unconditional surrender policy is John Eppstein's summary of Augustinian doctrine that even in a just war "Only so much violence may be used as is necessary: in the case of defense, only so much as is necessary to repel the violence of the aggressor" (p. 93). In other words force may be used only until the offending side gives us what we justly demand. As soon as the antagonist is

willing to do this, violence must stop. The unconditional surrender policy, however, refuses to state what satisfactions are required and just keeps on killing.

Winning Side Must Stop Fighting as Soon as Other Is Willing to Pay Its Debt

The Jesuit Francis Suarez, in *De Legibus ac de Deo Legitatore* says, referring to the offending state and to the prince: "If that State offers restitution he is obliged to accept it and to desist from war; and if he does not do so the war which he wages will be an unjust war" (p. 110). While worded for a just claim preceding the opening of hostilities, the statement would seem to imply that if at any time during a war one side is willing to give up what the other side has a right to demand, the latter must be willing to make peace. Edward Génicot, modern Belgian Jesuit, in *Institutiones Theologicae Morales*, states definitely,

"If when the war has already begun, the other party offers due satisfaction, this must be accepted: for otherwise slaughter and other evils would be uselessly multiplied" (p. 169).

One Must Notify Other Side of One's Claims Specifically

And the Committee on Ethics of the Catholic Association for International Peace reports that "to continue a war longer than is necessary for the protection or recovery of strict rights is quite as immoral as to begin it without sufficient cause" (*The Ethics of War*, Washington, D. C., 1932, p. 23). One infers that it is an obligation to tell an antagonist what claims one wants him to meet. It would appear to be unethical to say: We won't tell you what we want. We will keep on killing you until you unconditionally give us everything you have and are—after which we will treat you as sternly or as generously as we see fit.

Honor of Other Side May Not Be Unnecessarily Hurt

Something else which may indirectly be taken as a Catholic tradition against demanding unconditional surrender is the concern of several of the Popes that the honor of both sides be vindicated, that neither side be unnecessarily humiliated or lose face too much. In his famous peace plan of August, 1917, Pope Benedict XV. stressed as one argument for its acceptance at that

stage of the war that "the whole world . . . recognizes that on the one side as well as on the other the honor of their arms has been amply vindicated" (p. 218). The utter destruction of this honor seems to be the very aim of the unconditional surrenderists. Pope Pius XII., too, in his radio message of September 1, 1943, pleads that the stronger adversaries "give all nations the well-founded hope of a worthy peace, which shall not offend either their right to live or their sense of honor." Insisting on unconditional surrender would not give the adversaries "the well-founded hope of a worthy peace"; it merely allows them a blind faith, and the very act of unconditional surrender is hard to reconcile with retaining their "sense of honor."

Unconditional Surrenderism is Radically Wrong

In favor of extending specific terms of peace and therefore against demanding unconditional surrender, Pope Benedict XV., on July 28, 1915, said, "Blessed be he who will first raise the olive-branch, and hold out his right hand to the enemy with an offer of reasonable terms of peace" (p. 212). Offering "reasonable terms of peace" is the clean opposite of demanding unconditional surrender.

What About a Dictated Peace?

After unconditional surrender, there is to be a dictated peace imposed upon the vanquished. Apparently neither losers nor neutrals are to have representatives in forming the peace. The vanquished will be given a treaty to sign or be starved and slaughtered some more until they do sign. In 1919 they were forced even to sign a sole guilt clause.

As against the policy of a peace arbitrarily dictated by one side, John Eppstein, basing himself on several Catholic theologians, says,

"The only way in which nations can be obliged to pay reparations and indemnities without engendering 'a mournful heritage of hatred and revenge from generation to generation' against their former antagonists, is by the judgement and assessment, not of interested parties, but of an international tribunal" (p. 119).

Victors Have No Right to Dictate to Anybody

But in a dictated peace, obviously, one set of "interested parties" arrogate to themselves the responsibility of deciding

justly for a billion people all over the world. John Eppstein goes on to say, "Far more probable is it that a third party or a superior tribunal will, in such circumstances, give a verdict in which the indispensable virtue of social charity plays its proper part" (p. 119).

When Pope Benedict XV, on July 28, 1915, said, "May they resolve from now henceforth to entrust the settlement of their differences, not to the sword's edge, but to reasons of equity and justice" (p. 212), he would seem to have disapproved of a peace dictated unilaterally at the point of sword and starvation.

In his Allocution of December 6, 1915, he is almost specific in ruling out a dictated peace. He says:

"The way for peace . . . a peace that is just, lasting, and not profitable to only one of the fighting parties . . . is that which has already been tried and found good in similar circumstances . . . an exchange of ideas; . . . put forward . . . the aspirations of each one; . . . on one side and the other . . . concession on some point and renunciation of some hoped-for gain . . ." (pp. 212-3).

Neutral and Impartial Tribunal Should Supervise the Peace

As is apparent, in a dictated peace, the vanquished can put forth no aspirations and can make no concessions willingly, and of course there is no exchange of ideas. Pope Pius XII. (December 24, 1943) said that "a real peace in conformity with the dignity of man and the Christian conscience can never be a harsh imposition supported by arms." But a dictated peace is exactly an imposition supported by arms, and history has not recorded one that wasn't harsh and unjust. That is why Rev. Cyprian Emanuel and The Committee on Ethics of the Catholic Association for International Peace emphatically state:

"Inasmuch as both victors and vanquished always believe they have been in the right and inasmuch as no victorious nation can be assumed to treat the conquered nation with either justice or charity, the natural law indicates, if it does not actually command, that peace treaties should be made under the supervision of a neutral and impartial tribunal" (The Ethics of War, p. 48).

What About a Negotiated Peace?

The question of a dictated peace or a negotiated peace of course complement each other and when one is ruled out the other is ruled in. Theoretically one could have a negotiated peace after one side lays down its arms, but such negotiations would be more a form than a reality since in the end the side that laid down its arms would have to accept whatever terms the other insists upon. It would be virtual dictation, though it would argue for a better intention and more good will on the part of the winner than if he insists on a dictated peace. The ideal negotiated peace is one in which both sides can still negotiate with some semblance of equality, and where, if any terms are grossly unjust, they need not be accepted.

A world which for twenty years has mooned about the blessings of negotiating seems suddenly, now that the grandest of opportunities for it exists, to have developed a curious revulsion against a negotiated peace. Publicists who itch for the sadistic pleasure of trampling on the prostrate bodies of the vanquished have managed to convey the impression that a negotiated peace is peace-at-any-price and is the equivalent of letting the other side occupy the country. In fact, they picture a negotiated peace as for us precisely what unconditional surrender is meant to be for the enemy.

This of course is completely false. A negotiated peace is what Pope Benedict XV. described when, on July 28, 1915, he said:

"Why not initiate with a good will an exchange of views, directly or indirectly, with the object of holding in due account, within the limits of possibility, those rights and aspirations [of the various peoples], and thus succeed in putting an end to the monstrous struggle, as has been done under other similar circumstances?" (p. 212).

A Just Nation Must Always Be Ready to Negotiate

Such peace negotiations do not even require an armistice. But peace negotiations do give the peoples of the world a chance to support just terms and to withdraw at least their moral support from nations whose terms are unjust. It would appear that nations whose terms and wishes are really just have everything to gain in welcoming peace negotiations and nothing to lose. Only those whose wishes are unjust and who there-

fore could not get the world's support nor all of their own people's support for their terms have to fear peace negotiations or peace offensives.

As regards such peace negotiations, John Eppstein sums up the Catholic traditional teaching from St. Augustine to St. Thomas as follows: "Peace attained by conciliation is better than peace attained by victory" (p. 92). The Theological Conventus at Fribourg, 1931, declared that even "legitimate defense does not imply ipso facto the right to take punitive measures against the aggressor, or to set up the social process of war in such a way that the conflict between the aggressor and his victim is solved only by the arbitrament of the sword" (p. 141).

In other words to reject peace negotiations just to be able to march into Berlin and Tokyo so as to make their people realize how horrible war is and how completely and dishonorably beaten they are would not seem to be a Catholic idea.

Popes Always Spoke for Negotiating a Peace

On November 1, 1914, Pope Benedict XV. favored peace negotiations and an armistice when he said to the belligerents, "Surely there are other ways and means whereby violated rights can be rectified. Let them be tried honestly and with good will, and let arms meanwhile be laid aside" (p. 176). A few weeks before, on September 8th, when the war was little more than a month old, he begged "those who direct the affairs of nations" to "agree that already enough ruin has been caused, enough of human blood has been shed. Let them hasten to open peace negotiations and join hands again" (p. 204). Two years later, September 8, 1916, he said that as "Father of all Christians" he is supremely bound in conscience to . . . inculcate nothing else but peace . . . that especially in a war so murderous . . . the man who could shorten its duration by even a single day would be well worthy of the gratitude of the human race" (p. 213).

In his famous but unfortunately rejected terms of peace of August 1, 1917, "to the Leaders of the Belligerent peoples," the Pope did not expect an overwhelming victory by one side and an imposition by arms to bring a just and lasting peace, but he expected it from bringing "the peoples and their leaders to more moderate resolutions in the discussion of means that will secure a 'just and lasting peace'" (p. 215).

These statements show that for past wars the traditional attitude of the popes was to bring wars to an end by instituting peace negotiations, not by urging total victory at any price. As is to be expected, in this war, too, the papal pronouncements implore the same procedure. In the Vatican broadcast of May 13, 1942, Pope Pius XII. appeals "to statesmen that they may not let any occasion pass that may open up to the nations the road to an honorable peace of justice and moderation, to a peace arising from a free and fruitful agreement, even if it should not correspond in all points to their aspirations."

Pope Wanted World War II to End From "A Free and Fruitful Agreement"

Here is a call, clear to all who are not blinded by nationalistic war fevers, for a conciliatory peace, a compromise peace, a negotiated peace, a peace of "free and fruitful agreement," not a one-sided imposition supported by arms. It seems to be a call to the big leaders to open up peace offensives.

In his great Christmas peace message of December 24, 1943, the Pope, as if referring to various lusts for a dictated peace, speaks of "the unspeakable catastrophe of a peace built on wrong foundations and therefore ephemeral and illusory." While he does not say specifically that any dictated peace would be such a catastrophe built on wrong foundations, his declaration that "a real peace in conformity with the dignity of man and the Christian conscience can never be a harsh imposition supported by arms," is a warning against expecting justice from a dictated peace. He says further, "A true peace is not the mathematical result of a proportion of forces, but in its last and deepest meaning is a moral and juridical process." Dictation is not a juridical process.

In the following passage, the Pope's call for a negotiated rather than for a dictated peace would seem to be put beyond all doubt. He says, "The aims and programs of peace . . . should have as their supreme purpose nothing less than the task of securing agreement and concord between warring nations." It is obvious that "agreement and concord" can come only from "a moral and juridical process," from "a free and fruitful agreement"; it cannot come from dictation and an "imposition supported by arms."

American War Policies Were Not Christian (and "History's Most Terrifying Peace" is the Fruit)

One can say, therefore that the Church which can make a boast of not being blinded by nationalistic prejudices, which speaks as the Pope claims "in the full consciousness of our absolute impartiality toward all the belligerents" (May 13, 1942), does not favor total victory at any price for any side, nor unconditional surrender, nor a dictated peace but seeks a speedy end to the war in a conciliatory, consultative, compromise, negotiated peace.

CONCLUSION

In August 1936, too little and too late by twenty years, Winston Churchill said in an interview to the editor of the NEW YORK ENQUIRER, "America's entrance into the World War was disastrous. Had you stayed at home and minded your own business we would have made peace with the Central Powers in the spring of 1917, and by so doing would have saved the lives of over one million British and French" (Congressional Record, June 25, 1939, p. 1045).

In LIFE, August 5, 1946, H. L. Mencken said, "The English would never have contrived World War II if they had not been sure of Roosevelt's help . . . What is the net result? First, the Asiatic barbarians, held at bay since 1683, have been let loose in Western Europe" (p. 46).

In CHALLENGE OF WORLD COMMUNISM, former Congressman Hamilton Fish writes, "It is a strange coincidence that the German Visigoths saved Christianity from Attila and the Asiatic Huns in A. D. 451; that again at the battle of Tours it was the German Franks who hurled back the Saracens in A. D. 732; and that it was a German Count from Lorraine with 30,000 of his Rhine-landers who led the successful first crusade which freed Jerusalem" (p. 31). It remains to be added that it was the weapons and the unconditional surrenderism of America which finally delivered Christian Europe to the Eurasian hordes for the worst and most large-scale sacking, looting and raping in all of the world's agonized history.

The chapters about the peace after World War II tell a fearful tale. One can no longer speak of winning the peace, only of salvaging it. A peace that saw a million women outraged and twelve million people looted and driven from their homelands has been lost. But no matter how great the wreck by the Pharisaeic unconditional surrenderists, the peace must be salvaged. To repent and to salvage, that is the dreary destiny of the human race—and now, in top priority, of America.

America, the great self-righteous crusader, re-invented all the policies that prolong a war and lose a peace. During two thousand years Christianity has painfully introduced designs to humanize wars, to facilitate their end, and to improve the peace. It secured protection for non-combatants, immunity for the kings and leaders (to make it easier for them to surrender), respect for the women, guarantees of life and liberty for prisoners of war, and inviolability of the homes and belongings of the vanquished

War Humanitarians Revive Pre-Christian Barbarism

The American war politicians, on the wind of super-humanitarian sophistries, cancelled all this for a revived, veneered pagan and Judaistic pre-Christian barbarism. The crimes the half-civilized commit from weakness of the flesh, the American war humanitarians ordained as policies for "securing" the peace!

They re-introduced the unconditional surrenderism of Rome against Carthage. They reverted to the barbarism of executing as war criminals the enemy leaders. They preached total and unlimited occupation of enemy territory—and now are embarrassed because the Russians won't "de-occupy" the provinces allotted to them! They invented "reparations in kind"—and so provoked the most enormous sacking and looting in all history. They called for forced labor reparations—and so justified the Russian use of 5,000,000 German prisoners of war and scientists as slave laborers. They invented de-industrialization to "guarantee" the peace—and so achieved the most widespread vandalism ever committed by victors.

They urged securing territorial robberies by forced population transfers—and so fathered the "greatest crime of the age," the Potsdam-decreed expulsion of twelve million peoples by the Russians and Czechs. Finally, they gave their unconditional surrenderism such a logical no-rights-for-the-vanquished slant that our own American troops committed more vandalism, looting and raping than in any previous war—incomparably more than the German armies committed—and encouraged the half-civilized Bolsheviks logically to act as if outraging German, Austrian, and Hungarian women were a part of the great American "re-education" crusade.

Hating Germans Was Official U. S. Peace Policy!

Every one of these satanic policies is clearly required in the official Roosevelt-Morgenthau Plan. Those are the things America has to repent of, and to make amends for. Can anyone realize that until only a few weeks ago, our government and army's official policy towards the Germans was a policy of hate? "U. S. Army in Germany Scraps 'Hate' Policy," is the headline for an AP report of December 4, 1946, almost two years after German surrender. Officially reporting General Joseph T. McNarney, "The Army source said that 'we suddenly woke up to the fact that the policy of teaching U. S. soldiers to hate the Germans was out of date.'"

Hate policy out of date! Imagine this sort of talk from a professedly Christian government! Does anyone still wonder why this became "history's most terrifying peace"? Why it produced the worst vandalism, looting, raping and debauchery in history?

American Christianity Painfully Reasserting Itself at Last!

But, thank heavens, beginning with Secretary Byrnes's speech in Stuttgart, Sept. 6, 1946, furthered by this official scrapping of the hate-Germans policy, a painful crawl back to decency and Christianity has set in. It is however, a hard road, because we must not only reform ourselves, but, what is infinitely harder, "un-teach" our less civilized Allies the satanic policies we re-introduced into the Christian world.

That is a hard and humiliating thing to do. If we want to salvage the peace at all, we must tell our Allies, we must tell the Russians, that we have changed our minds and now condemn occupying enemy territory, destroying factories and shipping, taking factories and materials as reparations, using prisoners of war and scientists as labor reparations, deporting minorities and transferring territories without the consent of its people, splitting a country into sections, and treating the women of the conquered as if they had no rights (requiring only that one's own, marked by flags on their arms, be unmolested). We must tell them that we are sorry we ever advanced such horrible policies.

Making Amends for the Colossal Evils of Our Policies

And instead of going on talking about "re-educating" the Germans, we must beg them, and many other peoples, to forgive us the awful atrocities our policies caused to be inflicted upon them. While we cannot undo them, we at least must prevent further looting, raping, starving, and slave-labor abuse from now on. And what can be salvaged, must be. The provinces and cities torn from Germany, Italy and Japan without the consent of the people living there must be returned, all deported people must be restored to their homes, their belongings must be returned. Balkanized countries must be re-united. The factories, shipyards, monuments, and books stolen or destroyed by the Morgenthau-planned victors must be returned or rebuilt.

We Must Invite the Vanquished to Join in Making the Peace

Most of all, America must thoroughly repent of its arrogant policy of dictating a peace to the vanquished. We must immediately insist before all the world that the defeated peoples be given the same voice in making the peace as that which the victors in the Congress of Vienna gave defeated France in 1815. A good peace is a peace arrived at by all interested powers, big and small, victors and vanquished, and so just that all right-minded men everywhere can accept it and stand up for it. To settle the problems of Europe without the Germans, or those of Asia without the Japanese is an arrogance and stupidity which is criminal.

Any nation, no matter what its motives, which maintains policies of unconditional surrender and unilateral peace making (peace dictating) is doing the work of the devil—hunger, sin, misery, and more war! America's war and peace policies have done this work of the devil. By its fruits, we recognize it! May all who read this book, do their bit to bring our government back to the peace policies of Christianity: Doing to all countries as our own country wants to be done by.

INDEX

(General, but functional rather than complete; many incidental references are omitted or not repeated).

- Acadians, deported, 12
- Alaska, 80
- Allied crimes, 38, 39
- Allied Military Government, 17, 18, 23, 24, 54, 60
- Alsace-Lorraine, 6
- Anglo-American, 70
- Anti-Christ, 58, 59
- Appeasement, 36
- Argentina, 86
- Atlantic Charter, iv, vi, 19, 27, 33, 35, 42, 76
- Atrocity stories, 3, 5
- Attlee, C. R., 44
- Austria, 79;—Hungary, 32
- Axis War Criminals, 75
- Babel, Tower of, 4
- Baruch, 23, 52
- Bavaria, 47
- Benes, President, 47
- Berendsen, Carl A., 11, 13
- Berlin, 51
- Berlin Diary, 85
- Bevins, 82
- Big Three, 30, 40, 43
- Bishops, American, 36, 53; British, 36; German, 38, 44, 50, 53, 54
- Bolshevizing, bolshevik, 46, 58, 83
- Bombing Rome, London, 88
- Breslau, 36, 39, 45
- Britain, 70
- British Zone, 51
- Brooklyn Tablet, 20, 40, 48, 50, 54, 65
- Browder, Earl, 50
- Bullitt, Wm. C., 28, 29, 32
- Byrnes, Secretary of State, 53, 76, 105
- Byron's Prisoner of Chillon, 46
- Capitalists, 46
- Catholic, Catholicism, v, 40, 46, 48, 51; in this war, 7
- Catholic World, v, 61, 93
- Catholic Asso. for Inter. Peace, 96, 98
- Catholic Tradition of the Law of Nations, 94
- Central Christian Europe, iv
- Caveman peace, 1
- Challenge of World Communism, p. 103
- Chamberlain, Wm. Henry, 24, 60
- Chicago Tribune, 16, 58
- China, 70
- Christian Century, v, 52
- Christianity, Christian history, iii
- Christian reconstruction, 4
- Churchill, Winston, 33, 38, 40, 103; on expulsions, 10, 12
- Churchmen, 36
- Church nationalism, 93
- Civil War Reconstruction, 1, 3, 7
- Clay, Lt. Gen. Lucius, 50
- Collaboration, 89
- Colliers, 55
- Commencement Address, 1
- Compromise, 6
- Communism-ist, 1, 8, 47, 51
- Communist Fifth Column, 86
- Concentration Camps, 90
- Crawford, F.C., 84
- Crusading, 92
- Curzon Line, 33
- Czech, 32, 39; Czechoslovakia, 40, 44, 45
- Danzig, 6, 8, 24, 29, 32, 34, 35, 44, 70
- Dardanelles, 80, 81
- Death Penalties, 5
- De-Christianizers, 48, 87
- De-industrialization, 7
- De Jure Belli, 94
- De Legibus ac de Deo Legislatore, 96
- De-Nazification, 46, 51, 52
- Deportations, expulsions, forced migrations, iii, 10, 38, 39, 40, 41
- De Potestati Civile, 94
- Deutschland ueber Alles, American Century, Manifest Destiny, 91
- Dictated peace, 22, 26, 99-102
- Displaced persons, 39
- Dubuque Witness, 20, 44, 47
- Dulles, Foster, 82
- Dutch, 89
- East Prussia, 5, 31-4, 38-9, 43-4
- Eckermann, Conversations, 62, 63
- Economic injustices, 28, 29
- Eisenhower, General, 49
- Emanuel, Rev. Cyprian, 98
- Enforced peace, 73
- English Catholic Newsletter, 36
- Eppstein, John, 94, 95, 97, 98, 100
- Estonia, 31, 84
- Ethics of War, 96, 98
- Eulau, Heinz, 17
- Expediency, 14
- Eye for an eye, 16, 49
- "Famine in Germany," 45
- Faulhaber, Cardinal, 20, 49, 50, 51; niece, 49, 52
- Finland, Finns, 5, 6, 27, 31, 32, 75, 83
- Fish, Hamilton, 103
- Foreign Affairs, 21
- Fourteen Points, 1, 18, 19, 29, 76
- France, 25
- Freedom of the seas, 27
- Free Masons, 8
- French North Africa, 88
- Fulda Pastoral, 48
- Galen, Archbishop Clemens, 40
- Gang justice, 78
- Garmisch-Partenkirchen, 60
- Geddes, Sir Auckland, 1
- Geneva Prisoner Conventions, 55, 56
- Genicot, Edward, 96
- Germans, iii, iv, 27; "correctness," 84, 85; culture, 64; prisoners of war, 53-6; re-educating, 10; scientists, 58, 59; universities, 64
- German Liberal Democratic Party, 24
- Germany is Our Problem, iv
- Gibraltar, 74
- Girl's right towards victors, 23
- God, 4; is no monster, 15
- Goebbels, 18
- Goethe, 60-6
- Golden Rule, 5, 11
- Goodwill Men of, 9
- Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, 90
- Greeks & Trojans, 16
- Griffin, Archbishop Bernard, 85
- Hatred, 65, 66
- Hard, harsh peace, iv, v, 4
- Herod, 21
- Hitler, 18, 49
- Hoegner, Dr. Wilhelm, 47
- Hong Kong, 74
- Hospital, nationalizer, 52
- Humane manner, orderly and, 44
- Hundred Years War, 7

Hungary, Hungarians, 27, 31, 43, 45, 79
 Hurley, Patrick J., 86
 Human Events, 54
 Hutchins, Chancellor, 17
 India, 32
 Institutions Theologicae Morales, 96
 International force, 68
 Ireland, 32
 Italians, Italy, iii, 27, 48, 79
 Japan, Japanese, iii, 27, 74
 Japanese-Americans, 8
 Jews, Jewish, Judaism, v, 8, 16, 48, 49
 Jingoism, 65
 Joan of Arc, 7
 Johnson, President Andrew, 3
 Jordan, Dr. Max, 40, 54, 65
 Jungle peace, principles, 13, 81
 Just and honorable peace, 10
 Kant, 36
 Karelia, 8
 Katyn, 58
 Knox, Secretary of Navy, 91
 Knutson, Congressman Harold, 24
 Koenigsberg, 36, 39
 Korea, 82, 88
 Kruger, General, 34
 Kulaks, 5
 LaFollette, Senator Robert, 28
 Langer, Senator, 45, 48
 Latvia, 31, 84
 League of Nations, 12
 Lee, General Robert E., 3
 Lend-lease, iv
 Life, 29, 32, 54, 57, 82, 103
 Lincoln, 2
 Lithuania, 84
 Longfellow, 12
 Looting, ii, iv, 51, 85
 Love enemy, 78, 79
 Luce, Clare Booth, 8
 Ludwig, Emil, 48
 Lutherans, 46
 Lying, Churchill, Goebbels, 88
 Magnificat, v, 28, 60
 Making of Tomorrow, 93
 Maquis, 5
 Master race, 73, 74
 McNarney, General Joseph T., 104
 Memel, 32
 Mencken, H. L., 103
 Might and right, 23, 71
 Military necessity, 90
 Molotov, 82
 Monroe Doctrine, 90
 Monte Cassino, 90, 95
 Morgenthau, 16; -ists, 49, 57; plan, iii, iv, 2, 44, 55, 104
 Moscow Conference, 82
 Moses, 16
 Muench, Bishop A. J., iii, 17, 38
 Muller, Edwin, 2
 Murphy, Justice Frank, 19
 Mussolini, 89
 Napoleon, 60, 61
 Nationalization of property, 51
 Nazis, Nazism, 3, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 57; crimes, 38
 N. C. W. C. News, 38, 40
 Negotiated Peace, 99-102
 Negroes, 74
 Neutrality violation, 90
 New Dealers, 46
 New England States, 38
 New Republic, 17
 Newsweek, 56
 New York Times, 33, 41, 67
 Nicaragua, 90
 Nord-América, 51
 Nuremberg, 46
 Old Testament, 11
 Omnibook, 43

Osservatore Romano, 14, 41, 43
 Our Sunday Visitor, v, 10, 38, 46, 58
 Papal Peace Points, 4
 Paris, 25
 Parsons, Rev. Wilfred, 48
 Patton, General, 47, 48, 49
 Pearl Harbor, 14
 Peace-loving Big Four, 92
 Plebiscite, 6
 Poland, v, 5, 31, 33, 35, 39, 42, 75, 84; Polish officers, 58; territories, 81
 Pomerania, 33, 38
 Pope Benedict, 96-100; Pius, 3, 4, 6, 28, 67, 69, 70, 98
 Pope on hatred, 56; on just occupation, 80; on Master Principle, 72; on mistreating German women, 20; on negotiating peace, 100-2; on reparations, 19
 Posen, 38
 Potsdam, iii, 41, 43, 44, 76
 Power-politics, 32
 Progressive, 19, 50, 60
 Protestants, v, 48; on this war, 7
 Quebec Meeting, 44
 Quislings, 23, 89
 Rape, iii, iv, 16, 24, 60, 67, 85
 "Ravishing the Women of Conquered Europe," vi
 Raw Materials, 27
 Read, James Morgan, 3, 64
 Reader's Digest, 2, 82
 Re-education, 88
 Relocation camps, 90
 Reparations, 1, 19, 29, 71, 72
 Resistance movements, 62
 Reynolds, Quentin, 55
 Romans and Carthaginians, 16
 Rome, 46
 Roosevelt, President, 1, 33, 61, 67, 68
 Rosenkavalier, 60, 61
 Roussy de Sales, Raoul, 93
 Ruhr, 51, 70
 Rumania, 31
 Ruskin on expediency, 14
 Russia, 36, 39, 45, 70
 Sabotage, 90
 Saint Augustine, 100
 Saint Mary's University, 1
 San Antonio Light, 47
 Sands, Wm. Franklin, 11
 Schaeffer, Friedrich, 47, 48
 Schmitt, B. E., 35
 Scorched earth, 88
 Self-determination, 6, 32
 Sermon on the Mount, v, 8, 9, 11, 78
 Sherman, 3
 Shirer, Wm., 85
 Shuster, Geo. N., 35
 Silesia, 33, 38, 39, 44
 Slave-labor, iv, 6, 30
 "Slave-laboring German Prisoners of War," vi
 Slovaks, 32
 Socialism, v
 Sorrows of Werther, 61
 Spain, 5, 83
 Stab in the back, 89
 Stalin, 8, 33, 45, 68
 Stevens, Thaddeus, 2, 3
 Steinbeck, Moon is Down, 89
 Stoic's Golden Rule, 11
 Strauss, Richard, 60
 Stritch, Archbishop S. A., 13
 Stuttgart, 53
 Suarez, Francis, 94, 96
 Sudetens, 32, 39, 40, 44
 Suez Canal, 74
 Swift, Dean, 88
 Terms of Peace, 20, 21

Territorial Injustices, iv, 28; principles, 34
 Texas, 91
 Theological Conventus of Fribourg, 95, 100
 Theresa Neumann of Konnersreuth, 65
 There Shall Be No Night, 83
 Thompson, Dorothy, 21
 Time for Decision, 62, 64
 Time Magazine, iii, 19, 37, 39, 44, 49, 52, 83
 Thomas, Norman, v
 Tobias on Golden Rule, 11
 Treaties, validity, 20
 Trieste, 6
 Truman, President, 44, 76, 78, 80, 86
 Turkey, 81
 Tyrol, 32
 Unconditional Surrender, iv, 6, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, 95-7
 "Uncle Sam: Slave Dealer," 17
 United Nations, iii, 26, 43
 UNNRA, 39
 Vandalism, iv, 84
 Vanquished, v, 16
 Versailles Treaty, 2, 4, 13, 18, 28, 35
 Victors, 16
 Victory at any price, 94
 Vienna, 85
 Vittoria, Francis de, 94
 Wanderer, 45
 War criminals, 2
 War Department, 54, 55, 56
 War guilt, 2, 21, 71
 War of Liberation, 63
 Weimar, 60, 61
 Welles, Sumner, 42, 48, 64
 Werewolves, 5
 Wheeler, Senator Burton K., 86
 Wilson, 1, 18, 22, 26, 31, 33, 77
 Winchell, Walter 23, 48, 50, 56
 World Court, 30
 World War II, Cause, 32
 Wright, Dr. Herbert, 10
 Yalta, 1, 7, 27, 38, 43, 76
 Yamashita, 19
 Yardstick of just peace, 10, 11, 12